

FBIS**DAILY REPORT
CONTENTS***Soviet Union*

Vol III No 148

1 August 1983

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

Ustinov Warns of Retaliatory Soviet Arms Buildup [PRAVDA 31 Jul]	AA 1
U.S., NATO 'Propaganda Machine' Assailed [Korionov in PRAVDA 29 Jul]	AA 5
NATO Gen Rodgers' Statements at Interview Hit [Golubkov in Sofia NARODNA ARMIYA 28 Jul]	AA 7
Meeting of Nuclear 'Experts' in Brussels Scored [Levin]	AA 8
USSR Proposals on Nuclear Facilities Discussed [Dragunov]	AA 9

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' [Volskiy, Nekrasov, Andrianov]	CC 1
Detente Viewed	CC 1
'U.S. Global Strategy'	CC 3
Moscow TV's 30 Jul 'Studio 9' Program [Zorin, Zagladin, Primakov]	CC 8
Tense World Situation Eyed	CC 8
Discuss Lebanon, Mideast	CC 11
PLO Events, USSR Support	CC 12
European Issues, Arms Control	CC 13
U.S. Central American Actions	CC 15
Egypt Viewed	CC 18
Iran-Iraq War	CC 18
Soviet Foreign Policy	CC 19
European International Issues Examined [Shishlin]	CC 20

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Reagan Mideast, Central America Policy Assailed	A 1
Mideast Envoy McFarlane Gets Final Instructions	A 1
Reagan Candidate for Broadcast Board Withdraws [Yegorov]	A 2
U.S. 'Threats' Against UNESCO Denounced [Shabayev]	A 3

CHINA

Weinberger Visit to PRC 'Aggressive Strategy'	B	1
[Todorov]		
Chinese Mining Experts Visit Irkutsk	B	1
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 29 Jul]		
Latest U.S. Arms Sale to Taiwan Criticized	B	2
[Sergeyev]		

NORTHEAST ASIA

'Firmness' of USSR-Korean Friendship Noted	C	1
[Solovyev in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 27 Jul]		
Rerouting of 'New Jersey' Port Call Analyzed	C	1
[Biryukov]		
Peace Marches Seek To Prevent Another Hiroshima	C	2
[Andreyev]		
Japanese Trade Unions Council Opens Congress	C	3
[Golovnin]		

WESTERN EUROPE

France Seen Increasing NATO Integration, Military	G	1
[Zubakov]		
PCF Stance on French Nuclear Missiles Reviewed	G	1
PCF Delegation Visit to Uzbekistan Noted	G	2
Portugal-U.S. Negotiations on Airbases Suspended	G	3

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

U.S. Special Envoy McFarlane Begins Mid-east Tour	H	1
Tour Previewed [Musayelyan in SOVE SKAYA ROSSIYA 29 Jul]	H	1
Arrives in Beirut	H	2
PLO Official on Continued Soviet Support	H	2
U.S. Plans for Bright Star Exercises Outlined	H	3

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Soviet-Ethiopian Cooperation Protocol Signed	J	1
[EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA No 30]		
Sudanese Ambassador Departs From USSR 22 Jul	J	1
[IZVESTIYA 24 Jul]		
Angola's Jorge Receives AAPSO Delegation	J	1

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Ponomarev, Nicaraguan Minister Discuss C. America	K	1
U.S. 'Invents' Soviet Weapons for Nicaragua	K	1
CPSU's Gorbachev Receives Cuban CP Delegation	K	1
[PRAVDA 27 Jul]		

Ryzhkov Receives Cuban Young Communist Chief	K 2
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 22 Jul]	
Cuba's Calderin Awarded October Revolution Order	K 2
El Salvador's Agrarian Reform 'Failure'	K 2
Shitikov Receives Mexican Parliamentary Delegation	K 3
Delegation Visits Azerbaijan	K 3
PRAVDA Notes Soviet-Argentine Cooperation Talks [23 Jul]	K 3

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

USSR Marks 80th RSDLP Congress Anniversary	R 1
Andropov Attends Meeting	R 1
Variant TASS Report	R 1
PRAVDA Reports Meeting [30 Jul]	R 2
Government Decisions, Appointments Published	R 3
TASS 'Official Section' [IZVESTIYA 15 Jul]	R 3
Deputy Minister Appointments	R 5
[SOBRANIYE POSTANOVLENIY PRAVITELSTVA SOYUZA	
SOVETSKIKH SOTSIALISTICHESKIKH RESPUBLIK No 14]	
Republic Party Central Committees Hold Plenums	R 6
Moldavian SSR [SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 6 Jul]	R 6
Tajik SSR [KOMMUNIST TADZHIKSTANA 3 Jul]	R 6
Uzbek SSR Party, Government Bodies Convene	R 7
Party Central Committee	R 7
[Gladkov, Mukimov in PRAVDA 6 Jul]	
Additional Information [PRAVDA VOSTOKA 5 Jul]	R 9
Supreme Soviet Proceedings [PRAVDA VOSTOKA 7 Jul]	R 10
Vorotnikov Visits Volgograd 25-27 July	R 12
Activities Reported [PRAVDA 28 Jul]	R 12
Addresses Voters' Meeting [PRAVDA 27 Jul]	R 12
Vorotnikov Congratulates Expedition Members	R 16
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Jul]	
Stukalin Addresses Stavropol Party Plenum	R 17

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Party-State Agro-industrial Resolution Adopted	T 1
[PRAVDA 22 Jul]	
SELSKAYA ZHIZN Reports on Harvest Progress [28 Jul]	T 7

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Admiral Medvedev Notes Need for Combat Readiness	V 1
Further Events of Moscow Navy Day Reported	V 2
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Jul]	

USTINOV WARNS OF RETALIATORY SOVIET ARMS BUILDUP

PM301708 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Jul 83 First Edition p 4

["Answers by Marshal of the Soviet Union D. F. Ustinov, USSR Defense Minister, to Questions of a TASS correspondent"]

[Text] Question: Statesmen of the NATO member countries, above all of the United States, are spreading the allegation that the USSR "continues building up its military might, which goes far beyond the limits of its defense needs." Is that so?

Answer: The Soviet Union and its allies are maintaining their defense potential at a level necessary for the defense of the Warsaw Pact member-states. The essence of our military policy is effective defense and nothing above that. The USSR has never initiated the arms race and is not going to do so in the future. If we compare the military potential of the United States and the defense potential of the Soviet Union, they are roughly equal. Our military might is not greater than that of the United States. We do not strive for military superiority.

The question, however, arises: About what "limits" of the USSR's defense needs are the NATO leaders speaking? Proceeding from what do they determine the necessary, in their view, volume of our defense potential? They proceed from the premise that the defense might of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact should be inferior to the military might of the United States and NATO. The Soviet Union will not accept the "limits" that the United States is trying to impose on us.

We are for equality in nuclear and other weapons, for a renunciation of military superiority, not in words, but in deeds, as well as for talks without diktat and power pressure.

There exists a rough equality of military forces between the West and the East. This is a reality. This was recognized by three American presidents -- Nixon, Ford and Carter.

This is also recognized now by many prominent American figures. Only President Reagan and, recently, some other Western representatives, following in his footsteps, are speaking much and at length about the USSR's "superarmament". But in reality up to the early seventies the United States had superiority in the field of strategic nuclear weapons. There are fields, where it has advantage to this day. Look at some figures; the United States has at present more than 13,000 nuclear warheads in its strategic nuclear force, whereas the USSR has less; the strength of the NATO armed forces is 5.5 million men, while the Warsaw Pact has, even according to official Western sources, 4.9 million men. The United States has 13 aircraft carriers with 520 nuclear-capable aircraft on board, which are in service off the Soviet Union's coasts. The USSR has no aircraft carriers. This list could be continued further. The claims about Soviet military superiority, about the Soviet Union's superarmament are fabricated malicious lies that are constantly being disseminated.

But if we are to speak about superarmament, it is the objective of the country that has set up more than 1,500 military bases and installations in the territories of other countries; of the country that has created very big groupings of active duty armed forces ready for transfer to distant areas on short notice.

The country that, instead of limiting and reducing nuclear weapons is building up strategic offensive forces on an enormous scale over and above its needs, is deploying medium-range missiles in Europe and is thus creating a potential for inflicting a nuclear strike first; is heading into outer space in order to take the globe into the sights of its nuclear strike weapons, laser and ray weapons; is now spending already trillions of dollars on military preparations, is turning down all proposals for reaching agreement on normalizing the international situation. The name of that country is the United States of America.

Question: In connection with the talks on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe, Western propaganda continues to accuse the Soviet Union of being unconstructive and intransigent, of allegedly striving to ensure unilateral advantages for itself. It is even claimed that the USSR has a "monopoly" on medium-range missiles. Are there grounds for such claims?

Answer: There are no grounds for such claims. In talks everyone, naturally, presses for more advantageous conditions for himself. But if the subject of the talks are problems of fundamental interest for states, they can be conducted only with due regard for each other's legitimate interests.

This is precisely how the Soviet side is conducting things in Geneva. Our constructive proposals in Geneva are known. The USSR opposes any kind of nuclear weapons -- either medium-range or tactical ones -- in Europe. This is the real way to a nuclear-free Europe, and it is acceptable to us, as the Soviet Union has no aggressive plans. The United States and NATO remain silent so far and do not give any answer to our initiative, although almost 2 years have passed since it was put forward.

The USSR has put forward yet another plan, according to which both sides should reduce their medium-range weapons in the European zone by more than two-thirds. In so doing, the Soviet Union is ready to preserve for itself the same number of missiles as Britain and France have. We expressed readiness to reach agreement on equality, in each mutually stipulated period of time, of nuclear potentials in Europe not only by the number of delivery vehicles (missiles and aircraft), but also by the number of warheads for them.

As a result, the Soviet Union would have in the European zone far less medium-range missiles and warheads than prior to 1976, when we had no SS-20 missiles at all. In reaching agreement on such a basis, we are prepared to start equalizing the number of missiles of the sides even tomorrow. But wherein does the unconstructive character of our proposals lie? On the contrary, our proposals are constructive and responsible ones. They are a way to a reasonable compromise.

Those in the West speak a lot about the "intransigence of the Russians". But in what way, properly speaking, are we expected to concede? Are we expected to give the go-ahead to the introduction of Pershing and cruise missiles into Europe? Are we expected not to count the nuclear weapons of Britain and France on NATO's side? Thus they are demanding unilateral concessions precisely from us, wishing that we should agree to a direct damage to our security and that of our allies. Why must we be tractable on that point? We are not demanding anything of the sort from the United States.

The question of the nuclear weapons of Britain and France is deliberately muddled up under cover of the thesis about the Soviet Union's "intransigence". It is impossible to find objectivity in the very attitude of not counting these weapons among the NATO's medium-range nuclear force in Europe. This is NATO's frank striving to preserve big military advantages for itself in Europe.

As has been learned now, it was in Guadeloupe way back in 1979 that the leaders of the United States and the other major NATO countries reached agreement that the United States would appear at the Geneva talks alone, so as to be able, by referring to the bilateral character of the talks, to exclude British and French nuclear weapons from the count, and put in circulation the allegation about a Soviet missile monopoly in Europe.

But in actual fact, there is, of course, no Soviet "missile monopoly." The Soviet SS-20 missiles are only a counterbalance to the nuclear potential of the NATO countries in Europe, including to their missiles. Speaking of monopoly, it is precisely the U.S. side that would like to gain the privilege of keeping additional nuclear weapons near the Soviet borders, which is a strategic factor for the Soviet Union. "The United States would like to gain for itself a monopoly position by deploying near the USSR nuclear weapons capable of hitting targets deep in our territory while the USSR does not have and, certainly, if one is to follow American logic, should not have a comparable potential somewhere near the United States." This is precisely to what Yuriy Andropov drew attention.

It must be noted, for that matter, that when evaluating the NATO force, the United States itself invariably takes into account the nuclear potentials of Britain and France. The report to Congress of U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger on the military budget for 1983 frankly says that "NATO's long range naval systems include submarine launched ballistic missiles -- the British 'Polaris' and the American 'Poseidon' -- as well as carrier-based American planes." Mention is also made in the same report of French ballistic missile submarines, the only reservation being that officially they are not part of NATO. In its "white paper" on defense issues for 1978 the British Government said that "British submarines with 'Polaris' missiles are part and parcel of NATO's strategic force. They are capable of doing such damage to the Soviet Union that the Soviet leadership should take them into account."

The demand that the nuclear weapons of Britain and France be counted on the NATO side is not a bargaining point for us, but an objective need stemming from the interests of ensuring our security. Under any circumstances the Soviet Union shall and will have an equivalent to the above-said weapons.

Question: Claims have again been widely made recently, on the initiative of the U.S. Administration, that the USSR allegedly has a superiority over the United States in the field of strategic weapons. What will you, Comrade Minister, say to that?

Answer: At the present time there is rough equality in the balance of the strategic nuclear force of the Soviet Union and the strategic offensive force of the United States.

Seven years ago when the USSR and the United States were drafting the SALT II treaty, not only each figure but even each comma was verified many times. And when the leaders of the USSR and the United States signed that treaty in Vienna in 1979, they placed on record that parity existed between the Soviet Union and the United States in the field of strategic weapons. It remains to this day. But the whole point is that they in Washington have set themselves the aim of breaking that parity, of achieving military superiority.

Whatever component of the strategic offensive force of the United States we may take, each of them is to be re-equipped with new weapons systems soon. The "MX" ground-based strategic missile with 10 independently targetable warheads is being tested; a new mobile single warhead "Midgetman" missile and a new sea-based "Trident-II" missile are being developed; intensive work is under way to deploy in this decade 2 new strategic bombers (B-1B and "Stealth"); batch production has been started of long-range air- and sea-launched cruise missiles; preparations are nearing completion for the deployment of ground-based missiles.

And, as the leading Pentagon officials say, the United States will continue implementing all the above-said programs even if an agreement on a reduction of strategic weapons is concluded with the Soviet Union.

The Washington leaders use various gimmicks to cover up their policy of ensuring military superiority. They have set afloat a concept, according to which the weapons that are most developed on the Soviet Union's side -- modern intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM's) -- are declared as being destabilizing and subject to scrapping, while those in which the United States is strongest -- the modern submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBM's) and heavy bombers -- are to remain intact.

Indeed, the American side is guided by precisely this concept at the Geneva talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic weapons. The U.S. stand, the way it is now presented at the talks, is selfish and aimed at the Soviet Union's unilateral disarmament. It disregards our legitimate interests and presupposes the attainment of an overwhelming advantage of the United States over the USSR. It is being proposed that we actually reshape the whole structure of our strategic forces. The aim of these proposals is to undermine the USSR's strategic nuclear power.

Question: What will you, Comrade Minister, say about the propaganda campaign that has been launched in the United States and the other NATO countries with the aim of portraying the Soviet Government's statement of May 28 as a growth of the 'Soviet military threat' to the West?

Answer: The Soviet Union has never threatened and does not threaten anyone. By whipping up the "Soviet threat" myth, certain circles in the West are thus trying to distract the attention of the peoples from the real military threat, which is created by the U.S. Administration and some of its NATO allies.

The U.S. President has been recently ever more often saying, for example, that the "Pershing II" missiles are indispensable, that America also very much needs "Trident" missiles in order to "deter the Russians". But the speculation on deterrence is a camouflage. The American leaders consider it to be a disadvantage to them to tell the truth about their military preparations. Yet, in actual fact, the Pershing II and Trident missiles are a nuclear first strike weapon. And the Washington strategists are not concerned with "detering the Russians". The first nuclear strike doctrine has become the dominant one in the U.S. military strategy. The creation of strategic weapons systems and the buildup of the strategic force as a whole is subordinated to the possibility of implementing precisely that doctrine.

In the conditions of a growing military threat, it would be absolutely inadmissible for us to expose to risk the peaceful labor of the peoples of the countries of the socialist community and make it dependent on "peaceable assurances" of the instigators of the nuclear arms race. We know and duly appraise the policy of the imperialists, their attitude to the socialist countries and will never forget the tragedy brought upon the peoples by the policy of "appeasing" the aggressor. Mindful of that, we are duty-bound to take measures and to respond to the growth of the nuclear threat; respond in such a way that the sense of self-preservation should prevail in the potential aggressor over the intention to unleash an aggression against us.

We will take such countermeasures that will make the military threat to the territory of the United States and the countries on whose territory American missiles will be deployed the same as the United States is trying to create for the Soviet Union and our allies. And may those who are building up the arms race today realize, at long last, the dangerous illusory character of the drive for military superiority and the pressing need for reaching agreement in limiting and reducing nuclear weapons in accordance with the principle of equality and equal security.

U.S., NATO 'PROPAGANDA MACHINE' ASSAILED

PM291422 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jul 83 First Edition p 5

[Vitaliy Korionov article under the rubric "Political Observer's Notes": "Operation to Deceive"]

[Text] The propaganda machine of the United States and the other NATO countries is working at full capacity. The chief aim is to create in the public a false idea of the direction in which international events are developing. Everything is being done to suggest to the people that there is nothing to be alarmed about: the Geneva talks on limiting nuclear arms in Europe are not in jeopardy, the American delegation is adopting a "flexible position," and the United States is striving to reach an agreement. And if the United States does deploy its new missile weapons in Western Europe, this will merely accelerate the reaching of agreement. It is in this vein, for example, that the demagogic statement made in Brussels yesterday on behalf of the NATO special consultative group on questions of nuclear arms control is couched.

We have before us an example of a typical Washington propaganda operation, in which the leaders of a number of other NATO countries are participating. A trap is being set for adherents of peace. The aim of this operation is to psychologically prepare the peoples of Europe for the fact that American Pershing II and cruise missiles will appear on the European Continent at the end of this year.

In order to implement it a distorted picture is being painted of what is happening at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva. There really are no grounds for optimism. The latest round of the talks made no progress. And it would be naive to count on any when Washington's plans, to judge from its actions, do not include reaching an agreement based on the principles of the sides' equality and identical security. The more obvious to the people that Washington's aim of securing U.S. and NATO military superiority becomes, the more heart-rending are the shouts alleging that there is no military equilibrium in Europe and that only the deployment of new American nuclear weapons will guarantee it to the West. But a lie does not become the truth just because it is repeated thousands of times.

The existence of military parity in Europe has repeatedly been recognized by the U.S. Administration, the United Nations, and serious international scientific institutions. The situation here is quite clear. The USSR and the NATO countries have approximately 1,000 medium-range delivery vehicles on each side -- missiles and aircraft -- and no one can refute that fact. The Soviet Union has declared its readiness not to have in Europe a single missile or a single aircraft more than the NATO countries have today. In reply to the talk to the effect that in that case the USSR would have more nuclear warheads on missiles, our side has authoritatively explained that we are prepared to reach agreement on the equality of nuclear potentials in Europe in terms of both delivery vehicles and warheads, while, of course, taking into account the corresponding arms of Britain and France.

While the NATO apparatus of the "big lie" is trying to deceive the public, the militarists are getting on with the job. The preparations to deploy American missile weapons have entered the practical phase. In Britain, installations are being built at an accelerated pace to receive cruise missiles. In the FRG, work is getting under way for the deployment of Pershings. In Comiso (Italy) preparations are being made to receive cruise missiles. Similar work is getting under way, although less noticeably, in Belgium and the Netherlands. American military contingents are arriving to service the missiles. All this is being done behind the backs of the West European peoples and against the clearly expressed will of the peace-loving public.

By all accounts, Washington and its most zealous allies regard the deployment of the new American missile weapons in West Europe as something that is settled. British Defense Secretary M. Heseltine plainly announced in an interview in the American weekly NEWSWEEK: "I cannot imagine that deployment will be postponed. I cannot imagine that we will reduce the number of new missiles which we intend to deploy...."

NATO politicians are convulsively trying to find any arguments, even the most absurd ones, to justify the policy they are implementing of turning Europe into a nuclear magazine. Thus, the same Heseltine declares: "The Russians have not made any proposals approximating at all to the zero option." But it is high time the British secretary realized that the Soviet Union has no intention of participating in an unworthy game, whether it is called a "zero option" or an "interim option," since both are designed merely to ensure U.S. and NATO military superiority.

It is common knowledge that NATO now has 50 percent more nuclear warheads than the USSR. Let us assume for a minute that the USSR agrees to the latest American "interim option." What would happen then? NATO would end up with almost 150 percent more medium-range nuclear warheads than we would. To advance such demands means to deliberately deadlock the talks.

The United States would like to put itself in a monopoly position by deploying near the Soviet borders nuclear weapons capable of hitting targets deep inside our territory, while the USSR would not have a comparable potential anywhere near the United States.

Can the Soviet people indifferently overlook these facts? Can they remain detached observers of an arms race which is openly spearheaded against the USSR and its allies? They cannot and will not. But we are against the arms race. The USSR's constructive proposals lie on the table at the Geneva talks. Realization of the Soviet proposals would result in there being considerably fewer of both medium-range missile and warheads on them in the European part of the USSR than there were prior to 1976, when we did not have SS-20 missiles. It is now up to the American side to proceed to a businesslike examination of these proposals -- which it tries all the time to get out of doing. As for the Soviet Union, it advocates a genuine reduction in missiles and other arms on condition that the principle of the sides' equality and identical security is observed. No threats or saber rattling will make the USSR abandon its consistently pursued policy of defending peace and ensuring the peoples' security.

If, contrary to reason, the NATO countries still deploy the new American missiles weapons, they must be clearly aware of what this will lead to. The NATO countries' politicians, Comrade Yu.V. Andropov said in conversation with FRG Chancellor H. Kohl, constantly repeat that the USSR will make concessions in Geneva after the new American missiles are brought into Europe. This is a profound and dangerous delusion. If deployment goes ahead, we will not yield our positions or weaken our defense but will take timely and effective countermeasures to protect the security of the USSR and its allies.

The Soviet side has also repeatedly pointed out that the deployment of American missiles in Europe would result in a sharp change for the worse in the situation not only on our continent but also on the planet as a whole.

Is success possible at the Geneva talks? Yes, it is possible if the United States and NATO can at last assess the situation soberly and abandon their one-sided and hopeless approach to the talks, which pursues the aim of getting unilateral disarmament from the Soviet Union. Everyone who seeks not in words but in actions to reach an agreement aimed at removing the threat of nuclear war will find in the USSR a sincere champion of an agreement on an issue of paramount significance for the fate of European and world peace.

NATO GEN RODGERS' STATEMENTS AT INTERVIEW HIT

AU291202 Sofia NARODNA ARMIYA in Bulgarian 28 Jul 83 p 3

[Article by Vladimir Golubkov, Soviet disarmament specialist, APN: "General Rodgers on the Future of the West Europeans", especially written for NARODNA ARMIYA]

[Text] General Rodgers, Commander-in-Chief of the NATO armed forces in Europe, was recently interviewed by the FRG magazine QUICK. It turns out that for years there has been a "flagrant inequality," and a "wide open gap" in NATO's defense, which after the deployment of the "SS-20" missiles, "will go beyond the permitted limits." As far as the antimissile movement in Western Europe is concerned, the general accused its participants of collaborating in the "attempts of the Russians to assert their dominance in Western Europe without firing a single shot."

The very nature of the West German magazine's questions reflects the scope of the West European concern that the deployment of the "Pershing-II" and cruise missiles will not strengthen, but rather weaken the security of the FRG and the whole of Western Europe. Many people tend to view this deployment as a repetition of the "Cuban crisis" within a new geographical and historical framework. Rodgers has been reminded that nobody believes the tales about the United States having a serious approach to the negotiations, and that in practice Washington's approach reflects the U.S. striving for military superiority over the USSR.

There are a number of factors and claims that one could have suggested to General Rodgers for him to refute or clarify. For instance, the statement of the committee of the U.S. Chiefs of Staff on the existence of approximate parity between the USSR and the United States, and not of a "wide open gap." Or, how can General Rodgers explain the fact that now, after the USSR has deployed "SS-20" missiles and thus "gone beyond the permitted limits," according to the general, the NATO states are, despite all this, deploying intermediate-range weapons in Europe which can carry 1.5 times more nuclear charges in one launching than the corresponding USSR means? Further, the general could have been asked to comment on the postulates of the recently published Pentagon report "The Air Force in the Year 2000" on the "need for the United States to have its own nuclear first-strike potential in Europe in any event," and on the possibility of winning a "limited" nuclear war.

Rodgers will find no arguments to refute the conclusion about NATO's attempt to radically change the military-strategic situation in Europe and in the world in general, with the aid of the new missiles, to the detriment of the USSR and its allies. Neither can he reply to the argument that the United States would like to find itself in the monopoly position of deploying nuclear weapons under the USSR's nose which are capable of hitting objects deep inside USSR territory, while the USSR does not have, and of course, according to Rodgers' logic, should not have a comparable potential somewhere close to the United States.

His unfounded statement on the U.S. "serious" approach to the negotiations cannot change the obvious truth that the U.S. position in Geneva comes down to a demand for unilateral disarmament on the part of the USSR, while preserving intact the U.S., British, and French arsenals of nuclear weapons in Europe. He is of course familiar with the Soviet warning that the deployment of U.S. missiles in Europe will lead not to Soviet concessions in the negotiations, but to appropriate measures for ensuring the security of the USSR and its allies. He has no arguments against the USSR proposal to establish total parity in Europe between the two military-political blocs in the quantities of their missiles, aircraft, and combat charges, at the lowest possible level.

On the other hand General Rodgers totally rejects the hopes of his allies to have a say in dealing with the question of using West European territory for the cruise missiles, expressed in the British Government's recent White Paper, as well as in Rome and the Hague. "Those are U.S. systems, serviced by Americans," Rodgers says openly.

General Rodgers keeps his main argument for the end. Attempting to justify the U.S. position in favor of preserving the right to use nuclear weapons first, he stated that in 1945 President Truman decided to use atomic bombs against Japan in order to bring the war to an immediate end and prevent the "further increase of losses by both (?) sides."

Actually, Rodgers unwittingly posed an interesting question to the West Europeans. If in 1945 the "humanist" Truman unleashed a unilateral nuclear war against Japan in order to cut U.S. losses at the cost of hundreds of thousands of Japanese lives, we can guarantee that another "humanist" in the White House will not be tempted to follow the same road, under new conditions, only this time in Western Europe?

Perhaps the West Europeans have the right to ponder on this question, hinted at by the peace-loving General Rodgers?

MEETING OF NUCLEAR 'EXPERTS' IN BRUSSELS SCORED

LD300308 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2200 GMT 29 Jul 83

[Text] At NATO headquarters in Brussels, a so-called group of experts, who according to the Reuter agency were developing a proposal for reducing tactical nuclear weapons, have ended their work. At the microphone is Viktor Levin:

[Begin Levin recording] In the REUTER report there is a phrase that in my opinion provides the key to understanding what this selfsame NATO group was engaged in. Official representatives of NATO, it says in the report, will strive to achieve the maximum public effect from their proposals.

However, it is not only the given admission which witnesses to the fact that it is a question of a propaganda action clear and simple. Before the high level group conferences began at the NATO headquarters, a special consultative group met to discuss the course of implementing the plans for deploying new American nuclear missiles on the territory of Western Europe. And the leitmotif of their conclusions sounds absolutely unambiguous -- their deployment must take place.

The following detail is also noteworthy. Highly placed representatives of the American Administration, who had come specially from Washington, lorded over both conferences. The conference of the special consultative group, was chaired by Burt, assistant secretary of state for European affairs, [title as received] and in the high level group there was Perle, assistant secretary of defense for nuclear questions. They were the ones who provided the tone and who concluded the NATO orchestras on notes composed in the White House. And these notes -- as though sweet voices did not suit the melody -- were full of the growing rumble from the military machine.

The group chaired by Perle broadcast the possibility of reducing American nuclear warheads virtually a contribution to the cause of detente. However, in the first place, it is a question of those warheads which have become so out-of-date that the Pentagon no longer needs them. In the second place, even this proposal has a very preliminary character insofar that it will still be discussed by the ministers of NATO countries at their December meeting.

Now a clamor is being raised, which confirms the fact that the whole venture is following a purely propaganda aim. The United States and its partners are trying to deceive public opinion and to facilitate the implementation of the perfidious and highly dangerous plans for deploying new American nuclear missiles in Western Europe. But the numerous reports about active demonstrations by the West European public against the NATO intention give a weighty basis for drawing the conclusion that the propagandistic tricks of the American politicians are not achieving the desired results. [end recording]

US PROPOSALS ON NUCLEAR FACILITIES DISCUSSED

LD291352 Moscow TASS in English 1236 GMT 29 Jul 83

[Text] Geneva July 29 TASS -- TASS correspondent Georgiy Dragunov reports:

The intensive development of nuclear energetics is an objective regularity and condition for the development of an overwhelming majority of the states. At the same time the world community is concerned about the fact that nuclear power plants may easily turn into a source of enormous danger to the lives of millions of people in the eventuality of an armed attack. That is precisely why the initiative put forward by the Soviet Union at the 37th session of the U.N. General Assembly and aimed at ensuring the safe development of nuclear energetics has been met with total understanding at the Geneva Palace of Nations, where the Disarmament Committee is currently in session now.

The Soviet delegation, as Viktor Israelyan, the Soviet representative, stressed in his speech at the plenary session of the committee, firmly declares for a ban on deliberate attacks against civilian nuclear facilities. To achieve that aim it has tabled a number of specific proposals as regards the volume and procedure of implementation of a future international agreement on that issue.

"The Soviet proposals," Bulgarian delegate Borislav Konstantinov pointed out in his speech, "are an initiative premeated with concern for humankind's future. It accords with the interests of all peoples and states irrespective of the difference in the socio-political systems and the levels of economic development."

The demand for ensuring a safe development of nuclear energetic facilities and civilian nuclear facilities is persistently put forward at the committee session by representatives of both the socialist and non-aligned states -- Argentina, Burma, Brazil, India, Mexico and other countries.

Fresh in everybody's memory are the reminiscences of a brigand attack two years ago of the Israeli airforce against the Iraqi nuclear research centre.

Sweden's representative Rolf Ekeus declared for providing protection from a threat of an attack for nuclear power plants, research reactors, mills for the production and processing of nuclear fuel, depots for fissionable materials and nuclear wastes.

As is pointed out by political news analysts here, despite the difficulties, the debate on the issue of the protection of nuclear facilities from an attack is being held at the disarmament committee constructively and in specific terms.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD311658 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 31 Jul 83

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, member of the NOVOYE VREMYA editorial board; Vadim Nikolayevich Nekrasov, international observer of KOMMUNIST; and Boris Andrianov, foreign affairs commentator of All-Union Radio]

Detente Viewed

[Text] [Andrianov] We are meeting you, esteemed comrade listeners, on the eve of the eighth anniversary of an event which aroused considerable hope in the hearts of the peoples of the European Continent. On 1 August 1975 the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe was concluded with the signing of the Final Act in Helsinki. In this document the leaders of 35 states declared their determination to contribute to strengthening stability and security in Europe, to expand and intensify the detente process, and to make it forward-moving and enduring. At that time it seemed that the future of our old continent was guaranteed because the Helsinki spirit reflected the urgent aspirations of the European peoples, which considered that detente and not confrontation was in keeping with the vital interests of both East and West. The peoples of Europe hoped that the spirit of Helsinki would initiate an entire epoch of mutual understanding and goodwill in international relations, that political detente would be complemented by military detente and that, as a result, the all-European process would develop in a positive direction, having been put on a peaceful track.

[Nekrasov] Indeed, 8 years ago, on the day of the signing of the Final Act by the heads of state and government of 35 countries, and for some time after the Helsinki conference, this event was rightly regarded as the end of a lengthy period of struggle for the normalization of the international situation, which was waged by the Soviet Union together with the other socialist countries and all progressive forces. At the same time it was regarded as the beginning of a new stage, the stage of strengthening detente, creating a material basis for it and increasing its influence on the entire course of events.

I repeat, this was a quite justifiable view at that time. Today however we see a completely different picture. The international situation is complex and dangerous. The threat of nuclear war is spoken of as a real danger to the entire future of mankind. People cannot help asking: Was detente just a superficial and perhaps transient process? Many people in the world are now wondering whether acute confrontation between the two social systems is perhaps more typical of our epoch than mutually advantageous cooperation between them and peaceful competition.

[Andrianov] Incidentally, it has to be said that the leaders of the current U.S. Administration want to consolidate just such a view of the nature of international relations in the heads of millions of people throughout the world, and by all accounts they themselves are thinking in these terms. Jeane Kirkpatrick, one of President Reagan's closest associates, for example, bluntly states that this is the case. Force, she said, has always been fundamental to international relations. Nothing has occurred to change this situation. There is nothing to be ashamed of in that, she stresses.

[Nekrasov] Mrs Kirkpatrick's thinking evidently corresponds with the old principle of the Tsarist secret police: That is how it always was, that is how it always will be. However, as we know, the secret police were very mistaken and were forced to wind up their activities in 1917.

As far as sentiments like the ones you have been speaking of are concerned, Boris Vasilyevich, they might have some right to exist if it were not for such a factor as nuclear weapons and mass annihilation weapons in general in their present forms. Their existence and ability to destroy human civilization have placed the question of force in international relations on a completely new plane. If the peoples do not want mankind to commit collective suicide, then it is obvious that there is no reasonable alternative to detente, that is peaceful coexistence. They do not wish to understand this yet in Washington. But realization of this fact is spreading more and more widely throughout the world. It is penetrating ever more deeply into the awareness of millions of people.

It is precisely this awareness that is, in my view, the primary reason for the mighty scope which the antiwar, antinuclear movement has assumed in the world. Therefore, I would not agree with the assertion, for example, that the present period of increased tension has taken over the period of detente. In my view it would be more correct to put it this way: The characteristic feature of this period is acute confrontation between the policy of intensifying tension which is being pursued by reactionary, extremist imperialist circles, and the policy of preserving and strengthening detente for which all anti-imperialist forces are fighting. As it happens, that is the view taken by our party and the other fraternal parties in their assessment of the contemporary international situation.

Yes, Vadim Nikolayevich, there are also objective factors, events which really exist and occur, which confirm the things you have been saying. For example, the maneuvers to which Washington has been forced to resort at the Geneva talks on nuclear weapons. You know about these maneuvers -- all that talk alleging that the stand being taken by the U.S. side is flexible and that it aspires to achieve fruitful results at the talks. The reason for all this is, ultimately, one and the same -- that the process of detente is not dead, as the Americans declare. It is in its own right an effective factor in international relations and is forcing the reactionary forces of imperialism to maneuver in order to conceal their true positions, views, and intentions. Or let us take the state of affairs at the Madrid meeting, the meeting of the representatives of the states that signed the Helsinki Final Accord 8 years ago. In spite of all the opposition from the enemies of detente this meeting, the Madrid meeting, is ending on a positive note.

[Vekrasov] The Madrid meeting is like a ray of light in the dark kingdom that the imperialist forces would like to create in the world. In my view it is important even now to stress the three main positive results of this meeting, in the broad view. In the first place it has not ended in failure in the way that Washington and its NATO allies wanted. They themselves did not dare to wreck the meeting. This means that the opposition from the forces of detente, which these circles are experiencing, is sufficiently strong. In the second place it has been decided to convene a follow-up meeting in 1986 of the states that took part in the all-European Conference. The Helsinki process, the process of detente, will consequently continue. Thirdly, the first stage of a conference on confidence-building measures, security, and disarmament in Europe will commence in the near future. As you know, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have been insisting for a long time on the holding of this conference. The decision on the commencement of its work means that in spite of all the intrigues of its enemies, detente, the detente process, is an effective force.

[Andrianov] At the same time, Vadim Nikolayevich, I do not think that one can write off the opposition that for 3 years has come from the adversaries, led by the United States, of a successful conclusion to the Madrid meeting. You may recall that in order to achieve their objective they have resorted to all kinds of inexcusable strategem. They have dragged up the so-called Afghan question, which has nothing to do with the Madrid meeting.

They have created obstructions by issuing ultimatums to the Government of the Polish People's Republic. In this way they have tried to brazenly interfere in the Polish People's internal affairs and to establish an international precedent for the violation of the sovereign rights of all socialist countries in general. Right up to the very last days of the work of the Madrid meeting attempts continued to distort the meaning of the Final Accord by dragging into the foreground the question of so-called human rights in the socialist countries, as they are portrayed by imperialist propaganda, naturally. By means of slander over the state of affairs in the socialist world they wanted to distract attention from the principal and fundamental problem -- the problem of safeguarding security and developing cooperation among the European states. After all, the Helsinki conference was a conference on security and cooperation.

[Nekrasov] All that is indisputable. However, the opponents of the Helsinki process at the Madrid meeting have not been able to achieve their objective. What is more, it is important to note that they have received a rebuff not only from our side, the socialist side: The detente process has been defended by the neutral and nonaligned states of Europe, which did quite a lot of work to prepare a mutually acceptable final document. Finally, in the camp of the NATO countries there certainly was not unanimous support for Washington either. I think that in this respect the important thing is that this is the position of broad public circles in the West which are against the arms race and, therefore, in favor of detente. Thus a tense and very complex struggle is in progress over all these questions, which ultimately boil down to the principal and fundamental problem of war and peace.

But here is the thing that I would like to stress in this connection. A very important conclusion was drawn by the international communist and workers movement 15 years or so ago, which concerned the possibility of imposing detente on imperialism. I stress that word -- impose -- and not beg for or bargain over. That is how I would formulate the task that all the forces struggling for the very future of mankind are setting themselves today -- aiming to put an obstacle, a firm obstacle in the path of the ultrareactionary imperialist circles, in the path of deployment of new U.S. missiles in Western Europe, all in the path of Washington's entire present course.

[Volskiy] I think that in this connection one cannot help recalling a quite eloquent conclusion drawn not so long ago by the American magazine PROGRESSIVE in an analysis of the international situation. All the high-flown theories of military strategy, all the mysteries of geopolitics, and all the fabrications of the brains trusts, the magazine wrote, cannot alter the basic truth of our time, which is -- so the American magazine writes -- that foreign policy based on the use of force no longer makes sense.

[Nekrasov] Moreover, as Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov said, it is simply mad. Winding up this subject -- that of detente and the present international situation -- I would like to turn to certain assessments that were made recently at the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum. As you will remember, the plenum stressed that irreversible processes have already taken place in the world and all imperialist reaction's attempts to reverse developments are doomed to failure.

'U.S. Global Strategy'

[Volskiy] Vadim Nikolayevich, today you and I have been speaking of two trends in international politics. These are truly in confrontation with one another, both in Europe and other areas. Unfortunately, the trend toward detente does not predominate everywhere and tension is increasing in a whole number of regions. Last week this could be seen in Central America, where it was, perhaps, particularly evident and where the smell of gunpowder is growing stronger and stronger.

Washington is evidently preparing a large-scale war against the peoples of Central America -- no longer just on the maps at military headquarters, but on land, in the air, and at sea. The scenario for this war is more or less clear: To light the fuse it is intended to provoke a conflict between Honduras and Nicaragua -- for example, according to certain Western press reports, unmarked aircraft bombing Nicaragua and then Somozists dressed in Nicaraguan Sandinist Army uniforms attacking targets in Honduras. Then, in the second stage, it is planned to establish a sea blockade of Nicaragua. In fact, the current so-called exercises that are being carried out by the U.S. fleet off the shores of Central America is to be some sort of practice at establishing such a sea blockade, which may serve as the prelude to wide-scale intervention in Nicaragua.

Honduras then, as is reported by the Western newspapers which receive this information, may turn to the United States of America or the OAS to make some sort of corresponding decision -- if not the OAS, then the Americans will make a unilateral decision. Then a greater number of U.S. servicemen than are there at present may be sent quietly to El Salvador, since the ruling regime there is evidently not capable of dealing with the popular uprising on its own.

[Nekrasov] One may consider, Dmitriy Antonovich, that the Reagan entourage has apparently come to the conclusion that it isn't possible to do without U.S. troops.

[Volskiy] Well, in any case, the Americans are finding it harder and harder to act via their proteges in Central America and Latin America as a whole. Why is this? It is particularly because the so-called middle strata there -- the petty and middle-ranking bourgeoisie, and the intelligentsia, not to mention the peasantry and even part of the officer corps -- are turning their backs on the United States of America.

Here is an example: These very strata influence -- to various degrees, of course -- the policies of such countries as Mexico, Panama, Venezuela, and Colombia -- the countries that are now acting under the name of the Contadora Group. As you know, this group came out with an initiative for a peaceful solution to the problems of Central America. Who was it that responded to the initiative of the Contadora Group? Nicaragua and Cuba -- Fidel Castro personally -- responded to and approved the initiative. But Washington keeps looking for new pretexts to avoid a peaceful solution, essentially issuing an ultimatum: Either Sandinist Nicaragua changes its political and social system and its foreign policy to the course demanded by the United States of America, and the Salvadoran, Guatemalan, and Honduran patriotic forces cease their struggle, or else there will be a war of extermination.

[Andrianov] Dmitriy Antonovich, according to public opinion polls, more than 70 percent of Americans are seriously alarmed by the fact that the White House policy may draw the United States of America into the same hopeless and dangerous adventure as the aggression in Indochina. Surely these moods are an obstacle to the Reagan administration?

[Volskiy] Well, of course the administration can see that public opinion -- even far from progressive circles in the United States -- is taking an increasingly apprehensive view of Reagan's course in Central America.

[Andrianov] Dmitriy Antonovich, it is my idea that certain circles in the United States have deliberately untied President Reagan's hands. I have in mind the fact that roughly a month ago the U.S. Supreme Court annulled the legislative veto under the pretext that it was allegedly an unconstitutional practice. As you know, before this practice was annulled, the U.S. Congress could veto reckless actions by the White House that the legislators opposed -- albeit to a limited extent, of course. Now, however, Congress is not allowed to do this.

Congress has also lost the right to recall U.S. forces sent abroad by the President.

Yet Congress also used to have this right, on the basis of the 1973 law on military power. As you probably remember, this restrictive -- so to speak -- law was passed in the United States as a result of the stunning effect that the shameful failure of the United States' aggressive adventure in Vietnam had on U.S. public opinion. Now, however, the Reagan administration has apparently decided to forge ahead regardless, sweeping aside all obstacles that could have the slightest restraining influence on the White House's aggressive policy. This policy is truly assuming menacing forms in Central America.

[Volskiy] It was most opposite, Boris Vasilyevich, that you recalled that decision limiting the powers of Congress. It was, of course, passed in advance of the preparations for the Reagan administration's adventurist actions in Central America. There was propaganda preparation for it, as well, with efforts being made to suggest that the same old communist threat is creeping up on the United States, this time from the south -- from Central America. Efforts are even being made to twist the example of Vietnam that you mentioned to suit themselves. Vice President Bush, for example, said roughly the following: The United States lost in Indochina, but it must not allow this to happen in Central America. That is a very dangerous pseudologic, so to speak.

[Nekrasov] Speaking about the wide-scale maneuvers on the territory of Honduras and off the coasts of Central America, Dmitriy Antonovich, no less major maneuvers are starting shortly with U.S. Rapid Deployment Force in Oman, Egypt, and Sudan.

[Volskiy] Yes, and these maneuvers are timed to coincide with specific events, too. On the one hand, of course, they have to do with events in Chad: They are trying to back up French and U.S. policy there -- the policy of interference in the affairs of that country. On the other hand they are to back up the Israeli-American alliance's actions in the Near East. One can say that the radical flaw in all these plans that the Americans and their Israeli wards are now hatching lies in this: The radical flaw amounts to the fact that the Arab peoples reject them -- as Syria rejected the Israeli-Lebanese agreement, which was concluded under pressure from Washington. They reject all these plans ever more irrevocably. This leads to serious consequences on the political arena of the Near East, because having bet on Israeli militarism, Washington ultimately and inevitably intensifies hostility toward the United States in the Arab world.

[Andrianov] Dmitriy Antonovich, both the explosive situation in Central America and the extremely tense situation in the Near East, about which you spoke, are the most direct results of U.S. global strategy, which is dictated by the expansionist plans of the American imperialists.

This strategic course of Washington has already given rise to many complex world problems that aggravate the international situation. The problem of the Indian Ocean is one of these. The region of this water basin of world significance has long been renowned as one of the main storehouses of natural wealth on our planet. Ninety percent of world production of natural rubber, tea, and jute, 4/5 of gold production, and nearly 60 percent of tin and many other minerals are accounted for by countries on the littoral, where, apart from all else, potential oil and gas reserves constitute more than 1/2 of the entire world's resources in these raw materials.

Coveting these kinds of incalculable riches, the United States has unceremoniously declared the Indian Ocean region to be a zone of its vital interests and has included it in the sphere of guaranteeing the security of America. In backing these claims Washington conceived the idea of turning this international water basin into something resembling an American lake, in which the Armed Forces of the Stars and Stripes would completely hold sway.

We are witnesses of the accelerated rate at which the Washington strategists are urging on the process of the militarization of the Indian Ocean.

An intensified buildup of American military might is taking place there. The Pentagon already has around 30 military bases at its disposal in this region, and it is intended to increase the number of the servicemen stationed at these bases to 25,000 people, including some belonging to the so-called Rapid Deployment Force. There are nearly 40 American warships, including two-strike aircraft carriers, constantly flying in the waters of the Indian Ocean. Military aircraft, including strategic bombers carrying nuclear weapons, patrol the airspace above it.

[Volskiy] Boris Vasiliyevich, you say that there are weapons of mass destruction in the area of the Indian Ocean, in the air and on board ships. But it is not just that. As you know, Diego Garcia, an island that has become a major American bridgehead in the Indian Ocean, and dumps of chemical, bacteriological, and nuclear weapons are being created there. It is not just that dumps are being created: According to some data that has been in the Asian press, no fewer than 19 nuclear bombs are already being kept there, and there have even been reports about the possibility of deploying nothing more nor less than neutron weapons on Diego Garcia.

[Andrianov] In packing devices of mass destruction into its arsenals in the Indian Ocean basin, the United States does not consider it necessary to conceal the fact that they view military penetration of this region in terms of the practical realization of the nuclear first-strike doctrine. They regard it as nothing other than preparation for the so-called limited nuclear war. Herein lies the special danger of the Pentagon's plans, which are linked with stepping up U.S. military activity in the Indian Ocean.

[Enkrasov] Washington has now been seized by a mania of hegemonism that can literally be seen with the naked eye, and this can be perceived particularly in its behavior in the Indian Ocean region. Here is an example of the way Washington politicians simply decline to pay attention to the opinions of the states on the coastline: American guidelines in the area of defense covering the next 5 year period say that additional armed forces ought to be transferred to the Persian Gulf, and immediately stress with open cynicism that there is no need to wait for an invitation from our allies, the oil producing countries. In short, there is no point in standing on ceremony with them.

[Andrianov] One can see the imperial arrogance of the Washington administration in this lack of ceremony. Here it is not just a question of Washington's imperial ambitions, but of the fact that it is going all-out in its desire to implement its expansionist plans. Naturally, such tactics completely give away the intentions of the strategists from across the ocean. Their plans are hostile to the interests of the countries and the peoples in both hemispheres of our planet, including the Indian Ocean region.

Washington's creation of a central command, the United States' conclusion of a strategic alliance with Israel, and the extension of the network of American military bases all convincingly show that military actions, blackmail, and pressure are being increasingly exerted by imperialism against the nonaligned and other developing countries. It is not just that they are being targetted: Imperialism more and more frequently is going over to the direct use of force against young states and their peoples in its desire to impose its own customs upon them.

[Volskiy] The fact that pressure from imperialism, primarily American imperialism, is being intensified of itself shows that Washington and other Western capitals can see that opposition to this pressure is building.

[Andrianov] You do not have to go very far to find examples that confirm your line of thought, Dmitriy Antonovich. Approximately one week ago a regular session of the special UN Committee on the Indian Ocean ended at the UN headquarters. It took place in an atmosphere of sharp confrontation between the United States of America and the nonaligned countries, and it has to be said that the nonaligned are in the majority in this committee, which includes the representatives of 46 states. This organ obtained a mandate for the convening of an international conference on the Indian Ocean. However, the committee was hampered in implementing its powers by the Western representatives' obstructive position.

Naturally, the main stumbling block was the U.S. position. It should be noted that both within the UN and outside it a good number of forums have taken place in support of the idea of turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. On every occasion, however, the United States of America and its allies have put brakes on the movement towards that goal. The reason for the American sabotage is not so very complex: Washington is counting upon winning time in order to speed up the process of the militarization of the Indian Ocean region, which is being carried out in accordance with the plans of Washington's global strategy with the aim of achieving U.S. military superiority over the Soviet Union.

The Reagan administration is striving precisely towards this end. The United States of America has already deployed more than 1,500 military bases and objectives on other states' territory. It has created major groupings of armed forces that are constantly ready, and it keeps the means for deploying them to the remotest parts of the world in total readiness. Instead of limiting and reducing nuclear arms, Washington is building up excessive requirements for strategic offensive force on an enormous scale, deploying medium-range missiles in Europe and, at the same time, creating a potential to be the first to deliver a nuclear strike. The United States of America is rushing into space in order to bring our planet within the sights of its nuclear strike weaponry and its laser and ray installations. Already throwing trillions of dollars into military preparations, it turns down all offers to reach agreement on normalizing the situation in the world.

Replying to a TASS correspondent's questions, Marshal of the Soviet Union Ustinov, USSR minister of defense, stressed that for our part it would be quite impossible in conditions in which the military threat is growing to place the peaceful labor of the socialist community's peoples at risk and make it dependent upon peace-loving assurances from those who pioneer the arms race. We know and appropriately evaluate the imperialists' policy and attitude towards the countries of socialism, Comrade Ustinov stated. We shall never forget the kind of tragedy for the peoples that has resulted from the course of appeasing the aggressor.

Mindful of this, we are obliged to take measures and respond to the buildup in the nuclear threat, and respond in such a way that the instinct of self-preservation may prevail over a potential aggressor's intention to unleash aggression against us. May those who are whipping up the arms race today finally understand the dangerous illusory nature of the chase for military superiority. May they understand the urgent necessity of reaching agreement on limiting and reducing nuclear armaments in accordance with the principle of equality and identical security.

Our meeting at the roundtable has come to its end. Thank you very much for your attention, esteemed comrade radio listeners. Goodbye. All the best to you.

MOSCOW TV'S 30 JUL 'STUDIO 9' PROGRAM

ON310748 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 0807 GMT 30 Jul 83

["Studio 9" program moderated by Professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, political observer of Soviet television and radio, with Professor Vadim Valentinovich Zagladin, first deputy chief of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, and Academician Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, director of the Oriental Studies Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello, comrades. We are meeting with you in "Studio 9" of the Ostankino Television Center to talk about topical problems of world politics. Participating in our talk today are Prof Vadim Valentinovich Zagladin, first deputy chief of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, and Academician Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, director of the Oriental Studies Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Tense World Situation Eyed

In characterizing the political situation in the international arena today, practically everybody agrees that it is distinguished by great tension. One must declare that in the weeks that have passed since our last meeting here in "Studio 9," this tension has not abated but, on the contrary it has grown: The situation in Europe is affected by the fact that time is running out before NATO's so-called double decision takes effect -- when U.S. intermediate-range missiles will be deployed in Europe, the situation in the Middle East has once again seriously deteriorated; Washington's actions have brought about a considerable aggravation of the situation in Central America affecting the entire international situation as a whole.

But most political observers who describe the present situation as extremely tense add that this is not only a tense situation, but an extremely complicated one as well. I would now like to begin our discussion with a question to you, Vadim Valentinovich: Wherein lies the complexity of this situation and, if I can put it this way, what are the component parts of this situation that have created this complexity?

[Zagladin] Well, there is something to talk about, but I think it is probably worthwhile to begin with the first statement about tension. Why? Well, recently I received a letter, in fact several letters, from our television viewers that posed the question: Aren't we overstating this tension too much? Isn't there a danger of being too narrow in describing the contemporary situation? Of course, they say, there is a danger of war that is being created by imperialism. But imperialism has always created it. So what is so unusual about today? Why are we talking about this with such alarm?

It should be directly stated that there is no overestimation or exaggeration here because in fact, Valentin Sergeyevich, you are quite right: Not only do political observers characterize the situation as being tense, but so do politicians. Alarm can be felt in practically all of the statements of state leaders who occupy peace-loving positions. This is valid because, first of all, the arms race has now reached a truly monstrous scale. Besides, it is not only a matter of scale. We often talk about its scale, and this is as it should be. But besides its scale there is another aspect: New types of weapons are being created, which somehow bring weapons of mass destruction closer to so-called conventional arms. New types of conventional arms, like some of those used by the Israelis in Lebanon, are in fact practically weapons of mass destruction. In addition to these there are arms which are difficult to control.

The possibilities of effectively controlling the situation are decreasing. This in itself results in danger.

Furthermore, present-day military concepts, particularly those which have appeared in recent years -- first-strike and limited war concepts, the possibility of victory in this war...

[Primakov, interrupting] And protracted nuclear war.

[Zagladin]... and protracted nuclear war, too. All these are concepts of war. They are not simply spontaneous; they are being developed as very real plans for the future.

You have already mentioned hotbeds of tension. But they do not simply remain and become increasingly heated -- new ones appear. Until recently there was no hotbed in Central America. Now one exists, and we will dwell on this later.

Moreover, obvious attempts are being made -- of course these are only preliminary steps -- to form some kind of coalition of powers which would unite around the United States with quite definite aims. And finally, a propaganda, political, and economic war is being waged. Attempts to blockade the socialist countries are continuing, although they are now being labeled with other pseudonyms. So, in fact, the situation is tense. And there is a necessity and complete validity in declaring this.

But you are correct ...

[Primakov, interrupting] May I? I would add another element to this characterization of tension. These are situations of conflict which exist for very different reasons, but which are currently being used, and I would say they are part of the scheme of American plans to oppose the socialist world. They are part, an organic part, and attempts are being made to use these situations of conflict for confrontation with the Soviet Union.

[Zagladin] Quite right. This is undoubtedly an important element of the present situation. Valentin Sergeyevich quite correctly said that the situation is contradictory, one may say ambiguous, because in addition to these disturbing events there are other factors. First, there is the peace-loving policy of the socialist countries, which presently is very active. The 28 June Moscow declaration of leaders of fraternal countries discusses this and contains a large number of peace-loving proposals. The recent meetings and talks in Moscow, first with the leaders of the German Democratic Republic and then with the Hungarian People's Republic, also reaffirmed the peace-loving trend and vigor of the socialist countries' foreign policy.

After the conference in New Dehli the Nonaligned Movement undoubtedly became more active as a peace-loving force. Despite the fact that it is split into various factions and that various tendencies exist, the contemporary workers' movement on the whole quite unequivocally opposes military preparations -- with different degrees of activity and various degrees of pressure -- but on the whole it does oppose this. The recent meeting in Moscow between leaders of the French Communist Party and our leadership, headed by Comrade Andropov, once again demonstrated, as did the joint declaration of this meeting, this keen antiwar position of the contemporary workers' movement.

Finally, the antiwar movement has really turned into a powerful contemporary factor because it has for the first time in history embraced not only citizens and people, but also organizations, parties, and even parliaments. This is really a very serious new factor in world developments. In other words, there are a great many positive things.

Finally, one has to mention the fact that the official Western camp is far from united. The dissimilarity of the positions of Western countries is becoming more striking.

Far from all are prepared to agree with Washington's course and to completely surrender themselves to the grip of this course.

Thus, the situation is contradictory and ambiguous, but perhaps its complexity, its main complexity, lies in the fact that there is -- perhaps it is wrong to say a definite balance -- but there is something of the kind. There is a struggle between these negative and positive factors and this antagonism is proceeding for the time being without a definite outcome. Neither side has yet won.

The peace-loving forces have not gained victory over these negative factors while the imperialist side, primarily the United States which is inflating these negative factors and encouraging these negative points and trends, cannot take the upper hand.

[Zorin] Vadim Valentinovich, if we use chess terminology, does this mean that a stalemate has arisen in international politics?

[Zagladin] I do not think we can speak of a stalemate, although outwardly the situation looks similar. Why can we not talk about a stalemate? Because there is a real opportunity to achieve a positive solution to these questions and a way out of the situation. We have an example of this now in Madrid, although it is true it has not quite concluded. The concluding meeting will be held in September and, as you know, certain debates are continuing. But generally the participants in the Madrid meeting have arrived at definite joint conclusions on basic questions. This was not too easy because literally right up to the last moment the U.S. delegation adopted an obstructionist position and attempted to block a normal constructive dialogue by imposing its one-sided viewpoint. Nevertheless, agreement was reached. Why was it reached? Primarily because there was a common desire for agreement.

The majority of European countries, if not all of them -- and here the diversity of the Western camp was strongly evident -- came out for finding a solution to the questions and a way out. Furthermore, eventually all of them demonstrated a readiness during the final stage to consider mutual interests and not to attempt to unilaterally impose various unacceptable conditions on others.

It was interesting that the neutral and nonaligned countries played a major role in this. Ultimately, on the basis of their draft proposal, agreement was reached with certain amendments by the Spanish side. In short, despite the fact that it was very protracted, the Madrid meeting showed that where there is a mutual desire to achieve results and a rejection of one-sidedness this can be achieved. We are convinced that this is true not only for Madrid, but that this concerns other talks which are presently underway, particularly the Geneva talks on limiting and reducing intermediate-range nuclear arms and on limiting and reducing strategic nuclear arms. It is possible.

But to achieve this it is necessary for these principles to triumph. Unfortunately, at present we cannot say that they are succeeding there because the U.S. side continues to unilaterally impose certain positions of its own which boil down to a unilateral disarmament of the Soviet Union. Naturally, this business will not work and a mutually acceptable solution must be sought on the basis of the principle of equal security. If the U.S. side demonstrates this kind of willingness I am convinced that an agreement can be reached rapidly.

[Zorin] Now, inasmuch as we began our discussion with a statement about specific areas where tension is particularly evident, I think it would be correct if we continued our discussion by asking you, Yevgeniy Maksimovich, to say a few words about the situation in the Middle East and about what presently is making the situation particularly tense.

Discuss Lebanon, Mideast

[Primakov] I would like to stress that the following is absolutely not a purely propagandistic approach, but it seems to me that the entire complexity of the situation stems directly from U.S. policy. Take Lebanon, for example. I would like to talk about Lebanon and, at this point in our discussion, concentrate on it because Lebanon really is the key point in the Middle East situation this summer.

Unprovoked aggression occurred a year ago; unprovoked, I want to stress because not many know this, although some of our television viewers may. For 11 months before the Israeli attack on Lebanon a tacit cease-fire existed between the Palestinians and Israel. The Palestinians did not undertake a single action against Israel without provocation and initiated no actions from Lebanese territory. This is a fact. The aggression occurred a year ago. By a decision of the Security Council an unconditional -- I want to stress this word -- withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon was proposed several times. The United States voted for these decisions. It was forced to vote because a situation was forming in which it would have been completely isolated had it abstained. But what has happened? A year has passed since that time and the occupation continues. More than 40 percent of Lebanese territory is occupied by Israeli troops. Moreover, in order to legitimize this occupation and extend it the United States has carried out the business of concluding an Israeli-Lebanese agreement on the so-called troops withdrawal.

From the very beginning the Soviet Union disapproved of this agreement. Why? Because we assessed it as an attempt to replace the corresponding Security Council decision on an unconditional withdrawal. Israel explained its position by saying that Syria is not withdrawing its troops and that it is prepared to withdraw its troops together with Syrian troops. But this position is generally open to speculation. Why? First, because the Syrian troops are not there as aggressors against Lebanon, as is the case with the Israelis, but at the invitation of the Lebanese Government and on the basis of a decision of all the Arab states. Besides, the Syrians put the question quite clearly and unambiguously. They say that if Israel withdraws its troops unconditionally from Lebanon on the basis of the adopted Security Council decisions, they too are prepared to withdraw their troops. The position is quite clear.

Now, when a certain deadlock has developed in the situation -- and this is not a stalemate either -- Israel is carrying out a so-called redeployment of troops. What is behind this sensational operation, this so-called redeployment of troops which is presently being realized and about which a lot was said and corresponding decisions were adopted by the Israeli leadership, the Israeli Government, and so forth?

First, it is a shortening of the front and a concentration of Israeli forces in certain sectors, concentration of forces for a strike at Syria. They are not withdrawing troops from the Al-Biq'a Valley. It is precisely in the Al-Biq'a Valley that they are concentrating strike forces against Syria.

Second, troops are being withdrawn from the mountainous region and the outskirts of Beirut. It should be said that Israeli losses in these areas in particular were extremely great and perceptible. In the 10 months since the cessation of active military actions in Lebanon the Israelis lost, even according to their assessments, sufficiently large numbers, nearly as many as they lost during military activities.

Third, and I think this is one of the major points, one of the most important reasons underlying the so-called redeployment of Israeli troops is the fact that they want to firmly maintain the occupation of southern Lebanon.

In other words, they want to practically divide this country and put southern Lebanon under their permanent control.

There is another consideration by which they are apparently guided, and that is an attempt to represent the situation or the redeployment of troops as a step forward in order to reassure the Israeli public. It should be said that the Israeli public's dissatisfaction with the government's policy in Lebanon is being demonstrated most violently.

Under these conditions, the redeployment of troops and the partial, small-scale withdrawal is being proclaimed almost as a peace-loving action in order to reassure the public. It is indeed a small-scale withdrawal if we consider the fact that they presently occupy something on the order of 4,500 square miles of Lebanese territory and they are talking about withdrawing troops from 500 square miles. It is an insignificant withdrawal.

I should explain that I recently visited Lebanon and had the opportunity to meet the Lebanese leaders. The Lebanese leaders spoke quite frankly about the fact that the United States promised that it would influence Israel and that Israel would not carry out this partial withdrawal or this redeployment, which the Lebanese oppose quite justifiably because they believe that the matter should end with a complete withdrawal and not with some sort of partial measure. The United States made promises and even set some dates, something like 2 months. That is, in 2 months they would achieve everything. Of course, this is a game, a real game.

I do not think that the United States is simply unable to do anything with Israel, as its representatives often claim. It does not want to press demands and it supports virtually all of these Israeli actions, which essentially are aimed at dividing Lebanon and keeping part of Lebanon under Israeli control.

PLO Events, USSR Support

[Zorin] Since we have touched on the Middle East problem, Yevgeniy Maksimovich, I would like you to say a few words about events within the PLO.

[Primakov] I will begin by saying, and this is not a trite conclusion, that everything bad occurring in the region is, it seems to me, either directly or indirectly related to U.S. policy. In this case I see an indirect relationship in the fact that generally the latest events occurring in Fatah and the Palestine resistance movement -- and I am talking about the fact that a group of Fatah figures, a relatively small group, came out against the Fatah leadership -- threaten to split this organization. This is a direct result of the fact that aggression occurred in Lebanon, aggression against the Palestinians. This played a major role.

I have already said that a group has come out against 'Arafat's leadership and most of it is located in the Al-Biqa' Valley in Lebanon. I will not deal with this group's demands about democratization of the situation, and so forth. The main thing is not the demands, the main thing is a situation which may lead to a split and this, of course, could greatly weaken Palestinian resistance and the whole Palestinian cause as well as the struggle for the completely just demand for the right to self-determination, including the creation of a Palestinian national state.

The Soviet stand on this question was quite clear from the very beginning. It may be divided into a number of aspects. I would say that the first aspect is that the Soviet Union quite sincerely and quite frankly advocates the unity and independence of the Palestinian resistance movement.

The second aspect is that the Soviet Union supports the leadership of the Palestinian resistance movement, which is recognized by the Palestinian people and enjoys quite broad recognition among Arabs generally and on the international level. Finally, the third aspect is that the Soviet Union advocates a strategic alliance of the Palestinian movement, Syria, and other progressive states which are waging a struggle against Israeli expansionism. This position was, strictly speaking, presented to 'Arafat during his meeting with Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov in Moscow in January of this year. [Primakov gestures to Zagladin] Go on.

[Zagladin] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, doesn't it seem to you that this U.S. tactic that manifests itself very distinctly in the case of the Palestinian movement and generally in the Arab world is perhaps a splitting tactic, a split of its enemies and the setting off of one section against another? I believe that this tactic is now being applied everywhere because the same attempts are being made with regard to the antiwar movement; namely, to split it and to set off one section against another. The same thing is being done in Latin America. Generally, it seems that the principle is this: Because attempts to shatter this counterforce [orvetnoye dvizheniye] or protest movement -- either the struggle of the Arab peoples or the antiwar movement -- do not succeed, the splitting method comes to the foreground as obvious....

[Zorin, interrupting] Subversion.

[Zagladin] Yes, subversion.

[Primakov] Absolutely correct. I even think that your observation is important from the viewpoint of the Americans who [words indistinct] political settlement in the Middle East, on a compromise basis. Naturally, this would lead to certain losses in the U.S. position if this settlement were to occur. I do not mean the natural aspects associated with obtaining oil from the region and so on, but imperialist aspects, imperialist ones. A split precisely hampers the process of political settlement because when the Palestinian movement is unified and as it becomes more and more -- I am not afraid to use the word -- respectable around the world, and when they support a positive solution to the problem as has happened, then it is difficult for the Americans to do anything against this.

[Zagladin] Only subversion.

[Primakov] Only subversion.

European Issues, Arms Control

[Zorin] Well, we have talked about the complicated Middle East situation and we have mentioned the very complex processes occurring in Europe. Now, Vadim Valentinovich, I would like to return to this topic insofar as the situation presently developing in Europe is one of the most important circumstances of the entire international situation today.

[Zagladin] Yes, that is true. The thing is that all hot spots are significant and the situation in any one of them can threaten the cause of peace. Two world wars sprang up in Europe. We repeat this often, and justifiably so, because the situation developing here now can again lead to a conflict, and not just any conflict, but a nuclear conflict. The situation here is most difficult, severe, and acute, if you will. This is related to the missiles issue. We have already said a lot on this topic in these programs, so it need not all be repeated. Perhaps only a conclusion is necessary. Talks on intermediate-range nuclear weapons have been underway in Geneva for quite a long time -- 2 years in fact.

It is quite apparent now that the two opposing positions have been fully defined: The Soviet position, on the one hand, for reducing the available nuclear arsenal in Europe up to its complete elimination, and the U.S. position to go to any lengths to add to this arsenal by deploying new U.S. missiles on the other.

Generally, I get the impression that the Americans are presently conducting talks not about how to reduce arms, but about how many missiles they should deploy. They are going to great lengths to get as many of their missiles as possible into Europe. Besides, certain maneuvers are being resorted to at present around this issue. The matter is that this U.S. pressure, this missile pressure, has resulted in a peculiar situation.

We have already spoken about the antiwar movement. This is truly a major factor in the contemporary international situation. This movement sprang up in the European countries and was precisely against the U.S. missiles. Besides, this movement united completely opposite forces which appear to have only one thing in common: A desire to save the continent from a new war, a nuclear war. Now, perhaps one thing can be discerned in this movement: A consciousness on the part of the Europeans that they are in fact Europeans, and a feeling of unity on the continent in the face of the approaching threat.

This is a defensive reaction now, a reaction to a negative phenomenon. But at this level, it can be said that there are already positive manifestations. In other words, this community consciousness is forcing the movement to not simply oppose missiles but to come out for the development of peaceful relations and for the development of cooperation in Europe, which in itself is most positive.

It is precisely this development -- a somewhat peculiar and also contradictory one, as can be seen -- which is now forcing the United States to undertake certain maneuvers. On the one hand, attempts are frequently made to create the impression that American flexibility will supposedly bring success in Geneva. On the other hand -- and this is repeated quite frequently now -- they say: Well, what will happen? So, they will deploy more missiles; everything will continue as before. Economic and cultural ties will continue; after all, nobody will break diplomatic relations. Talks will also continue. The Americans are even trying to disseminate the idea that if missiles are deployed the Soviet Union will become more compliant as a result and the talks will then proceed successfully. If there has been a deadlock up until now, then success will be achieved after the deployment of U.S. missiles.

This is a dangerous illusion. Dangerous because its aim is very simple: to hoodwink this movement, to hoodwink the European people, and to conceal from them the real consequences that may result from the deployment of U.S. missiles. The fact is that this changes the situation in Europe, changes the strategic situation throughout the world, compels us and our allies to adopt retaliatory measures, and to deploy new missiles in order to counter the threat from new U.S. weapons. In addition, these missiles will reach the sites of these weapons both in Europe and in the United States because the new U.S. missiles in Europe will be aimed at Soviet territory. Correspondingly, the retaliatory threat should also extend to American territory.

Besides, this is precisely what they are attempting to conceal. They are trying to conceal the fact that deployment of missiles will seriously complicate the situation. It is clear that this will completely undermine the basis of the current talks. In fact, a U.S. deployment of missiles would mean that the West wants to break off the talks unilaterally. This is the real situation.

This is no improvement at all nor will it ensure success.

On the contrary, it would be a breakdown, a planned breakdown. Can this be avoided? I already said that it could be, we are convinced of this because there are options which fully correspond with the interests of the Europeans, but which do not suit the United States.

Here I would like to note another feature of the European situation. On the issue of missiles, if we take the population of Europe as a group, differences in the interests of the Europeans and of U.S. ruling circles can be seen quite clearly. But now this concerns the ruling circles of most of the European countries as well, because the U.S. missiles decision, the imposition of its missiles, and its economic measures -- measures and attempts to organize a trade, credit, and technological blockade against the eastern socialist countries -- are not simply directed against us -- although they are aimed primarily at weakening the socialist community, but are aimed at Western Europe as well.

They want to dig a trench across the middle of the European Continent to partition the East from the West. In this case it would be much easier for the United States to take the West European countries in hand and subject them to its much stronger and more rigid control -- in other words, to realize the hegemonist aims which Washington has nurtured for ages.

This factor again results in the most contradictory consequences. Old competitive contradictions are deepened and a new contradiction appears, a contradiction that differs from all others: A contradiction over the question of how to develop relations with the East, and, if you will, how to defend capitalism in the new situation. The Americans say: By force. The Europeans say: Other methods must be found because force yields nothing, it solves absolutely nothing, and it leads to a dead end.

In short, the situation is truly complicated; however, those positive factors which we have enumerated are perhaps acting more strongly in Europe than in any part of the world. The antagonism there is more acute and it is exacerbating. Autumn promises to be very hot in Europe.

U.S. Central American Actions

[Zorin] From what you have said about the situation in Europe and the situation in the Middle East, it is completely obvious that the basic destabilizing force in the current international situation is Washington's policy. This is seen very clearly and very graphically in the crisis situation, the complex situation which has now arisen in Central America. If during the first months of this year Washington tried to at least somewhat cover up U.S. interference in the affairs of a number of Central American countries, namely El Salvador and Nicaragua, then recently Washington is acting openly. I will not list the facts that you, comrade viewers, know from television, press, and radio reports. You know about the U.S. squadron that was sent to the Pacific shores of Central American countries and know that many political observers see this as a step by Washington toward organizing a blockade of Nicaragua. A blockade is an extremely serious action even in peaceful times and is fraught with far-reaching consequences. I must say that Washington is now making no secret of striving to overthrow the Nicaraguan Government by armed means.

I must say that this is neither some kind of sudden change nor a tactical maneuver. This has become part of the military and political strategy of the current Washington Republican administration. If in the fifties and sixties Washington emphasized the Far East in its foreign expansion plans and subsequently added the Middle East, then in the eighties one can see more and more clearly the tendency of a special emphasis on Latin American countries. This is not an accidental circumstance. This region -- Central and Latin America -- has primary significance particularly for U.S. monopolies, and not entirely for geographical reasons, although geography plays a definite role.

Suffice it to say that of 20 types of minerals of which the United States has a shortage and of which it does not have enough from its own resources, most are received from Latin American countries. Specifically, the United States receives more than 90 percent of its bauxite, almost 100 percent of its tin, 57 percent of its lead, 47 percent of its copper, and a significant portion of its oil from that region. Naturally U.S. monopolies cannot think about giving up these resources. Meanwhile revolutionary processes and patriotic movements, which are very unpleasant for Washington, are increasing in Latin American countries.

[Zagladin, interrupting] Valentin Sergeyevich, may I interrupt you here? These figures are very interesting because they are a good reply to current, active U.S. propaganda. Last week President Reagan gave his latest speech on Latin America. Its theme was that every event in Latin America is led by subversive forces that are inspired or directly guided by the Soviet Union, Cuba, or other socialist states. In other words, by sending their ships to the shores of Nicaragua, the U.S. is fighting against foreign interference.

[Zorin] A communist plot.

[Zagladin] Yes, a communist plot, as he says. This is very strange. The Soviet Union, like our fraternal socialist countries, has never exported revolution or interfered in affairs in any way, particularly in the affairs of Latin American countries. We believe these countries should solve their problems themselves and wholly support their struggle to achieve this aim. However, we never have and never will interfere. Here is the reply to the U.S. argument. This oil, this tin, this bauxite -- these are the factors that determine U.S. activities.

[Zorin] Yes.

[Zagladin] And another thing. Precisely now, during these days -- or rather during these weeks -- Latin America is observing Simon Bolivar's bicentennial. Well, did he also act on instructions from Moscow? After all, he did the same thing that all Central American peoples are doing now.

[Zorin interrupting] This is a very interesting thought. The liberation movement 200 years ago began in Latin America and was determined by internal causes, just as the patriotic movement in Latin America today is not the result of someone's machinations but the result of internal processes.

According to the data from international organizations, 43 percent of the population in Latin America exists in conditions of extreme poverty, with an annual income of less than \$200 per family. Also, according to data from international organizations, 35 percent of the Latin American population cannot provide themselves with even the minimal necessary amount of food. This is the situation in which certain processes develop. They are not introduced from the outside but are fostered within the Latin America, and the attempts to explain these processes by someone's machinations are unfounded.

Today we have talked about complex and diverse processes in the political arena. This seems to also apply to the situation in central America. On one hand, there is an attempt by the current Washington administration to create a very dangerous situation assisted by the intensification of military measures. On the other hand, there is a great concern in the United States with this government line. One may say that the U.S. public now finds itself under the definite specter of a new Vietnam, influenced by memories about how this shameful adventure ended. Very influential forces in the political arena are opposing Reagan's present policies. It is no accident that Reagan now considers it necessary, in order to somehow indoctrinate U.S. public opinion, to create a certain nongovernment commission, and bring Henry Kissinger out of retirement to head it.

Reagan tasked the commission with creating a document that will not so much formulate a government program as much as convince the U.S. public of the lawfulness of present administration activities. It is probably not difficult to imagine how this commission will act if we remember that it was precisely Henry Kissinger who was one of the central figures in the plot against the socialist Government of Chile headed by Salvador Allende. Precisely Henry Kissinger played an especially gloomy role in the Vietnam war years and in the decision to bomb Kampuchean cities. One can imagine what this commission will produce.

Incidentally, the question before certain political figures now is: Why is the Reagan government now intensifying the situation regarding Central America? There can be many answers to this. In any case, certain observers are talking about the fact that pre-election considerations are having an effect. Mrs Thatcher's success at the elections greatly impressed Reagan and he would like to have his own Falkland Islands.

[Primakov] Valentin Sergeyevich, this may be so. Generally, the United States is doing a lot in considering events with upcoming election interests in view. It is the same, for instance, in the Middle East where McFarlane has replaced Habib, the U.S. mediator who conducted talks with Middle East countries. Many see this as an attempt to demonstrate -- not to do, but to demonstrate -- that supposedly the White House is intensively and immediately concerned with political questions, because previously McFarlane was a White House employee and worked for the President.

However, one should stress another point in this situation which you discussed. The Americans are sending their Navy, are taking extreme measures, and are intensifying tension precisely at the moment when the Latin American states themselves are completing positive solutions.

[Zagladin] Quite right.

[Primakov] This is very important in understanding U.S. actions. I believe they are directly aimed at suppressing this initiative, at not giving it an opportunity to develop, and at replacing it with a new outbreak of tension in the region.

[Zorin] This is a very important consideration, because in addition to the domestic movement, the United States, by twisting and untwisting the crisis in Central America, comes into conflict not only with, say, Nicaragua, but also with Latin American states that understand that U.S. policies are directed not only against Nicaragua, but against Latin America as a whole. Therefore, this is a serious limitation and a serious obstacle to Washington's actions. I think that you completely correctly notice that Washington is now attempting to anticipate the actions -- the joint actions -- of Latin American countries.

On the other hand, Washington resorts to the tested method -- we have discussed this today: To try to split the unity of opposing forces if a frontal attack does not succeed and to try to act from within to subvert their unity. Strictly speaking, this is done in Latin America; there is similar experience in the Middle East. Yevgeniy Maksimovich, this relates to U.S. actions at one time regarding Egypt and also, obviously, elements of this are associated with the Iran-Iraq war. It is apparently so.

[Primakov] Yes, I think so. Moreover, Americans often act contrary to objective developing processes and trends, contrary precisely to these objective processes; after a while the bankruptcy of their policies is largely apparent. I do not want to speak onesidedly by saying that they reap no successes. Naturally, in their undermining efforts they do achieve certain things. This is completely obvious. However, they have no positive successes and cannot have any.

Egypt Viewed

In this regard, Valentin Sergeyevich, I would like to dwell very briefly on the situation in Egypt. First, Mubarak is not as-Sadat. Of course, I would not go so far as to idolize Mubarak. He is continuing the line directed at maintaining the country along the course of the Camp David policies, but at the same time the nuances that he introduced are apparent in his position and they bear witness to the bankruptcy of the Camp David deal and the Camp David line which the United States is behind.

Recently, for example, there was the sensational issue of Egypt refusing to return its ambassador to Tel Aviv. On 29 September last year Egypt recalled its ambassador from Tel Aviv because it could not act otherwise when Israel essentially organized that nightmarish crime, the massacre of Palestinians at two refugee camps, Sabra and Shatila, in Lebanon. After this, Israel, [correcting himself] Egypt recalled its ambassador. Now, despite the insistence of the Americans and pressures from Israel, Butrus Ghali, Egypt's minister of state for foreign affairs, recently came out and said that Egypt cannot return its ambassador to Tel Aviv because, first, Israel refuses to completely withdraw its troops from Lebanon; second, because of the circumstances of Israel conducting aggressive policies; and third, until Israel creates appropriate new political realities in the Middle East.

Of course, the forces pro as-Sadat who have linked themselves very closely with as-Sadat's course, continue to be active in Egypt. However, some kind of polemic with these forces is appearing. From this viewpoint, I would like to examine President Mubarak's latest speech. He delivered it on 23 July in connection with the 23d anniversary of the Egyptian revolution. In his address, Mubarak first of all spoke very warmly about an-Nasir; second, he directly polemicized with those forces that believe, as he said, that everything was fine and good in Egypt before the revolution. In other words, this polemic....

[Zorin, interrupting] Something which had not been discussed for a long time publicly in Cairo.

[Primakov] For a long time. Of course, this had not been discussed for a long time, but now it has started to be discussed. I think that the main reason why Egypt now is not moving onto a path which completely and wholly satisfies the country's interests is because of the pressure from the United States. However, I think that in this regard also the United States will far from succeed. Of course, we must take into account the fact that Egypt is now following the course of Camp David and that is emphasizing its special relationship with the United States, and so on. But I do not think that the country's interests, in the final analysis, will not somewhat rectify this course.

Iran-Iraq War

[Zorin] Apparently attempts to use the disagreement in the camps of those who have relations with the United States also occur in regard to the Iran-Iraq war.

[Primakov] You are unquestionably right. Moreover, as you know and as our television viewers very well know, the Soviet Union has from the beginning been categorically against this war, believing that the only ones who would win from it would be the imperialists, the Zionist forces, those who oppose ending the consequences of Israeli aggression. Both Iranian and Arab reaction would win. Events show that these assessments were completely accurate. Already the war has been going on for almost 3 years. According to various estimates, Iran has lost 100,000; Iraq has lost 40,000. There are a lot more wounded on both sides. Moreover, there is no end to the war yet in sight.

Why? Not because there is a lack of mediatory efforts. There have been too many various mediatory missions from nonaligned countries, from the Islamic community, as well as from Arab countries in the Persian Gulf region. And Iran sort of receives these mediatory missions, but on meeting them puts forward ultimatums which border on interference with the internal affairs of Iraq, and this blocks the end of the war.

Moreover, it seems to me that a certain link exists between this position and the changes which have unfortunately begun to occur recently in Iran. When the Iranian revolution began we felt great empathy toward it. Everyone, all Soviet people. Progressive slogans were proclaimed, autocracy was overthrown, an anti-imperialist course was stressed. Finally, the U.S. bases on Iranian territory were abolished, which was extremely important. The Soviet Union not only expressed empathy, but I think one can boldly say that because the Soviet Union exists and because the Soviet Union took this position there was no direct U.S. strike on Iran to end the entire revolutionary process. Then, also as a result of this, the gamble on an economic blockade of Iran did not materialize.

Now, however, disturbing events are gradually starting to develop. I will dwell on a number of points. The so-called observer council created under the Majlis recently completely blocked, froze, the law on agrarian reforms proclaimed in 1980. Why? It declared that it was not an Islamic law because it threatened private property. As a result, 80,000 major landowners still own land in Iran, and among them one-third are clergymen.

Further, a law was blocked, a draft law on the nationalization of foreign trade. Further, so called reprivatization -- the return of enterprises confiscated by the state -- is now proceeding as a return of enterprises to former owners, and many of these former owners are counterrevolutionaries. Thousands of these enterprises are being returned, and only 51 people are entered on lists, forbidden from engaging in economic activity. These are the most discredited people under the regime.

Finally, there was a strike against leftist forces, leftists who had been at the sources of the revolutionary process, leftists including the Tudeh Party. All this is very alarming. We naturally want to have good-neighbor relations with Iran, and it is awfully unpleasant when, unprovoked and absolutely with no grounds, certain anti-Soviet and anticommunist voices resound in Iran.

Soviet Foreign Policy

[Zorin] Today we discussed the complexity and ambiguity of the political process occurring in the international arena, processes taking place in world politics. Naturally the question must arise, what is the Soviet foreign policy line in these very complex and contradictory conditions?

[Zagladin] I would say this is a question which has two answers. One is the generally principled answer that our line has remained as it was. This is not as banal as it may seem at first because, when the West turned to more and more active confrontation, naturally the question arose before us, what to do? To reply to the confrontation with the same harsh measures or not. After serious deliberation our leadership, in my opinion, came to the only correct conclusion, namely, that this course would only assist those who want to kindle confrontation. Another course was selected, right up to the harshest measures. If missiles were to be deployed, we would deploy our own missiles, a military rebuff. However, at the same time we would continue our line of returning to detente and developing peaceful cooperation in order to ensure stable peaceful coexistence among states with different social systems.

This line, which was the basis of the decisions of the 24th, 25th, and 26th CPSU Congresses, has not changed. Moreover, there are no grounds for changing it because this line was based on taking stock of the real correlation of forces in the world. This correlation has not changed, and nobody can change it. The parity between the two military alliances of socialist and capitalist countries will not change. The correlation of forces between the national liberation forces and movements and imperialism will also not change. But if it did, it would most likely be on the part and in favor of the national liberation forces, and so on. Therefore, there are no grounds for our changing this line.

However, although the previous (?scope) remains, at the same time new elements appear because life requires a certain correspondence in our line with the changing situation. This is taking place. How? I can say that our policies are distinguished by a great dynamism and increased vigor. We are trying to act very effectively to quickly consider new changes, to introduce new supplementary proposals, and so on. We are trying wherever possible to put forward constructive ideas that enable the solution of existing problems by way of talks. Moreover, while so doing we consider not only our own interests and positions, but also the interests, the lawful interests, of the security of our peoples, and the positions of public, social, political, and other forces.

All our proposals on European affairs, and on the Middle East, take into account the lawful interests of the security of peoples, not only the interests of the Soviet Union. Moreover, a selfish approach to these questions would be totally alien to us. Furthermore, wherever possible, we are striving to save and improve relations with all countries with whom these relations have deteriorated for one reason or another. This fully applies to the United States. We talked a great deal today about the United States, and stated that its policy was the main reason for the difficulties existing today, a factor which undoubtedly redoubled these difficulties. However, on the other hand, our line aimed at achieving improved relations and truly peaceful coexistence with the United States remains unchanged, and if, unfortunately, developments are not as they should be, then once again it is only because the other side does not accept this line accordingly. Finally, we are exercising great flexibility in efforts to achieve mutually acceptable solutions and promote the search for mutually acceptable solutions wherever possible. Madrid, as we have said, is a good example and apparently there are other examples.

Of course, the success of our policy and its entire implementation do not exist on their own. This policy is guided by the country's life, its development, and the success of this development. As a matter of fact, it is guided by the labor of our people and therefore, I think that everyone who listens to this program or, to be more precise, watches it can say with total confidence that the success of our foreign policy depends on him as well as on how he, in his position, does the work entrusted upon him, on whether we will be able to solve the tasks set by history in the way we want it, that is, in the spirit of peaceful coexistence, in the spirit of strengthening peace, and not in the spirit of confrontation. This depends on him, on all of us.

[Zorin] Well, our time on the air has run out. I am left to thank you for taking part in our talk and you, our television viewers, for your attention. And so, until we meet again here in our Studio 9. Thank you.

EUROPEAN INTERNATIONAL ISSUES EXAMINED

LD312103 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 31 Jul 83

[From "International Panorama" program presented by international affairs journalist Nikolay Shishlin]

[Text] Hello, comrades. Tomorrow is the eighth anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Accord.

This was a great event in the life of Europe and the world. In 1975 a code for peaceful coexistence came into being. Then, in 1975, 33 countries of Europe, plus the United States of America and Canada, agreed to make efforts towards giving rich content to the process of detente and making detente comprehensive and all-encompassing.

In the last 8 years a lot of things have come to pass. Regrettably, the position taken by the United States and its NATO allies has caused a lot of what was achieved in the development of peaceful cooperation to be lost. If the question of whether detente is alive or dead is raised today, then we must turn to Madrid.

As you know, 34 states have agreed on the final document of the Madrid meeting, which has continued for nearly 3 years. I said 34 states, since to this day the representative of Malta is holding back [rezerviruet svoyu pozitsiyu], since Malta insists that the Madrid final document should include a point about convening an experts' meeting on Mediterranean problems. For different reasons many delegations object to this idea, and so now all are awaiting news from Valetta, the capital of Malta. There are signs to the effect that Malta might come round to a new approach to the situation that has been created. In any case, it is thought that the Madrid meeting will be completed successfully and the all-European dialogue will be continued.

The past week, as any other week, contained events at different levels, which can be assessed in diverse ways. The political calendar has been so full of events that it seems that every week state officials and diplomats go through twice as many days as there are in a week.

Very recently a meeting took place between French President Francois Mitterrand and West German Chancellor Kohl. It was a so-called working meeting. Strauss, the well-known West German political figure, has visited Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the GDR. There were other meetings, too. One simply could not enumerate them all. But what sort of themes are being discussed? In essence, there are two:

The first is the question of the so-called Euroweapons, that is, the fate of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear medium-range weapons. The second problem is the future relations between the socialist and capitalist countries of Europe. Properly speaking, these are the theses being propounded: The first thesis is that, unlike, shall we say, what was maintained in the very recent past and is now being actively popularized by the West, an agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States of America is possible. It is possible up to the end of the year. The second thesis is that if American nuclear missiles are deployed in Europe, this will not reflect fundamentally on the mutual relations of socialist and capitalist parts of Europe.

Here full clarity is necessary. It is true that agreement is possible, but this does not depend only on the Soviet side. It depends on whether the American side will make concrete active efforts in the interests of achieving a mutually acceptable understanding and, I will add to this, how the British and French political figures, who are in many ways to blame for the present deadlock at the Geneva talks, will react to this.

As regards the future of relations between socialist and capitalist states of Europe, of course if the American weapons are deployed, it is completely clear that the possibility of achieving an agreement will become highly and extremely problematical, and a murky shadow will fall on relations between socialist and capitalist countries in Europe. This is completely plain.

REAGAN MIDEAST, CENTRAL AMERICA POLICY ASSAILED

LD311546 Moscow TASS in English 1456 GMT 31 Jul 83

[Text] Washington July 31 TASS -- Rough blackmail and pressure towards sovereign states, outright interference into their internal affairs, stake on military force or threat to use it -- such are the main elements of the U.S. policy in Central America and the Middle East. That was reaffirmed once again by an interview which President Reagan gave to a group of American journalists.

Justifying the aggressive imperialist course of his administration towards Central American states, he said that Washington does not intend to depart from what, in the U.S. opinion, should be done in the region. The boss of the White House proclaimed the bandit formations of former Somoza men, through whose rough hands the United States conducts an undeclared war against the people of Nicaragua, as nearly champions of human rights, who allegedly strive to ensure what is associated in the United States with democracy.

President Reagan made it clear that the United States is going to step up secret subversive operations against Nicaragua, which are financed through CIA channels, by giving all-round support to counter-revolutionary scum in a bid to destabilise and overthrow the Sandinist government, to impose upon the Nicaraguans a puppet regime, suitable to Washington. The U.S. President tried to whitewash the El Salvador rulers who are waging a war of annihilation against the people of the country. The U.S. Administration is known to be pressing for a sharp rise in military aid to El Salvador. In Washington they pretend that allegedly they know nothing about atrocities perpetrated by Salvadoran troops trained by American "military advisers". Many thousands of Salvadorans, including women and children fell victim to terror this year alone.

As to Reagan's pronouncements on the Middle East, from these it is clear that the United States intends to continue heightening tension in the region and to use it to further its aggressive designs. The President welcomed Israel's recent decision on redeployment of the occupation troops in Lebanon. What is at issue is Washington-Tel Aviv collusion aimed at partitioning and annexation of southern areas of that sovereign state and the build-up of the American military presence there. Reagan did not conceal that his administration was going to intensify pressure upon Syria, the principled stand of which in the question of settlement in Lebanon is viewed in Washington and Tel Aviv as an obstacle to furthering imperialist plans in the region.

MIDEAST ENVOY MCFARLANE GETS FINAL INSTRUCTIONS

LD302132 Moscow TASS in English 1817 GMT 30 Jul 83

[Text] Washington July 30 TASS -- U.S. President Ronald Reagan met with his special Mideast envoy Robert McFarlane. U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz was present at the meeting.

The White House declined to disclose what was discussed during the meeting. However, according to local observers, there is no doubt that Robert McFarlane, who recently took over as special Mideast envoy from Philip Habib, received the last instructions before his first tour of the countries of the region next week. According to U.S. press reports, the tour will take Robert McFarlane to Syria, Lebanon, Israel, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Jordan.

According to THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, Robert McFarlane's instructions include no fresh proposals on the Middle East problem. It is believed here that President Reagan's new envoy was instructed to try and take the sting out of bitter criticism of an openly anti-Arab course of the U.S. Administration. Robert McFarlane took part in the talks with Israel Foreign Minister Shamir and Defense Minister Arens in Washington last week. During the talks the sides actually discussed the realisation of the U.S.-Israeli plan for dismembering Lebanon. The ASSOCIATED PRESS reported, quoting a high-ranking administration official, Robert McFarlane would try to encourage Saudi Arabia and other moderate Arab regimes to bring pressure to bear on Syria whom Washington and Tel Aviv regard as an obstacle in the way of the implementation of their expansionist plans.

Observers regard press reports that U.S. army units from the interventionist Rapid Deployment Force have already begun preparations for large-scale military exercises Bright Star to be held in Egypt, Sudan, Somalia, and Oman as military support for Washington's fresh diplomatic offensive. According to a UPI report, the unloading of U.S. troops and combat equipment in Egypt will begin August 1. During the exercises the United States is to dispatch to the Egyptian coast one of U.S. aircraft carriers complete with a group of its support and escort ships.

REAGAN CANDIDATE FOR BROADCAST BOARD WITHDRAWS

LD300531 Moscow TASS in English 2241 GMT 29 Jul 83

[Text] Washington July 29 TASS -- TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Yegorov reports:

Thomas Ellis, a lawyer from North Carolina, sent a letter to President Reagan on Thursday informing him that he had decided to withdraw his candidature to the post of member of the Board for International Broadcasting. The board supervises the subversive radio stations Liberty and Free Europe, operating under CIA aegis.

Ellis has long been associated with Reagan, whom he helped during the 1976 presidential election campaign, and also is a close friend of Senator Jesse Helms, a Republican from North Carolina and an ultra-right wing politician. It is, perhaps, these qualifications that made Ellis a prospect for membership of the board for International Broadcasting, a nest of malicious anti-Sovietes and arch-reactionaries waging psychological warfare against socialist countries.

However, when the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee held hearings on Ellis's candidature, certain details of his background that came to light made even the White House confused.

It has become known, for instance, that at one time Ellis was at the head of an organization which aimed to prove that the blacks were genetically inferior to the white race. He is a strong proponent of racial segregation. During the 1976 presidential election campaign, trying to secure the victory of his patron, Ronald Reagan, in the primaries in North Carolina, Ellis had printed and released ultra-racist leaflets. He has vast interests in South Africa, which he recently visited at the invitation of the Pretoria racist government with all expenses paid.

As a consequence even the Senate Committee, in which the Republicans have the majority and in which Ellis has influential backers, suggested that President Reagan withdraw Ellis's candidature. The White House has obviously decided that there are too many political scandals as it is to take up arms to protect another crony of the President who has fallen into disgrace and got Ellis to withdraw his candidature.

U.S. 'THREATS' AGAINST UNESCO DENOUNCED

LD292259 Moscow TASS in English 1900 GMT 29 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 29 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Boris Shabayev writes:

Washington is again bristling with threats, this time directed against UNESCO. As J. Hughes, a spokesman for the Department of State, has announced, the United States is reviewing the question of its participation in the activities of that international organisation because of Washington's differences with it.

But how did UNESCO get into Washington's bad books? Well, the U.S. Administration does not like its efforts to establish a new world information order and to eradicate "information imperialism", that is, the complete and uncontrollable sway of the Western mass media in the developing and non-aligned countries. Neither does it like the meaning which UNESCO, speaking for the majority of its members, tries to impart to the world information flow, stressing the primary role and great responsibility of the mass media in the struggle for safeguarding peace and promoting mutual understanding among nations. All this is characterised as nothing less than violation of "the freedom of the press" in the language of Mr Hughes and his superiors.

Washington is also irritated by the support given by UNESCO to the struggle waged by the Namibian people for their independence, the support demonstrated so forcibly at a representative international conference which recently took place in the headquarters of that organisation. The participants in it put Washington in the pillory for its continuous and comprehensive complicity with the South African racists. Washington is also incensed by the strong denunciation by UNESCO, as well as other international organisations, including the UN, of the criminal policy of genocide pursued by Israel's ruling Zionist coterie against the Arab people of Palestine.

Washington indeed has more than enough differences, not with UNESCO or the United Nations as such but with the world community whose positions these prestigious organisations reflect. Small wonder that American delegations to international forums find themselves in isolation more and more often.

Carrying on in this vein, Mr Hughes's colleague, Jeane Kirkpatrick, the chief U.S. delegate to the UN, makes threats to sovereign countries that their attitude to the USA at the United Nations will not pass unnoticed. Together with Senator Moynihan, her predecessor in that post, she demands "punishment" for the world community and a "lesson" to the United Nations and its specialised institutions, including UNESCO. It appears that certain Washington figures think in all seriousness that the entire world community, represented by the UN or UNESCO, is marching out of step and that Washington alone is keeping it. However, the Boston-published CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR thinks that it is the other way round and that it is the incumbent U.S. Administration that is out of step with all the other UN members. The newspaper is undoubtedly right here.

WEINBERGER VISIT TO PRC 'AGGRESSIVE STRATEGY'

LD292252 Moscow World Service in English 1430 GMT 29 Jul 83

[Text] It has been announced in Washington that Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger will visit China between the 25th and the 29th of next September. Commentary by Vasily Todorov of Radio Moscow: The rumor that the Pentagon chief is to visit China had been afloat since early spring. But it had somewhat subsided in recent weeks because of the argument between the Americans and the Chinese over American military supplies to Taiwan. However, the other day President Reagan personally specified the date of the visit, a sign of the importance that Washington attaches to its military contacts with Beijing. When the President broke the news he would give no details apart from saying that the Pentagon chief will have talks with his counterpart, Zhang Aiping, and other officials on issues of common interest. But according to REUTERS, spokesmen for the Defense Department on the same day made it clear that Mr Weinberger would mainly discuss military supplies to China.

Reports on the coming visit have caused controversial comment, but observers are unanimous in the view that if China requests what the American military are expecting it will, the United States would have no problem in meeting such requests. Indeed, in its day the Carter administration cleared the way for American military supplies to China. First, it lifted the restrictions on sales of military-related technology, then it allowed sales of first defensive and then offensive weapons, not that the distinction between the two types is clearly defined. This time the American secretary of defense will offer more items, including means of radioelectronic control of troops, communications and surveillance facilities, and a team of helicopters.

In its commentary, the American press points out that the arms manufacturers are interested in major deals with China. And the job of the defense secretary will be to promote their projects. However, the Americans obviously have other reasons to offer China sophisticated weapons. They would like at least to appease China's displeasure at the continued flow of American arms to Taiwan. [Words indistinct] the chief reason is that Washington would like to tie China to its aggressive strategy in Asia. Significantly, when Mr Weinberger visits Beijing, it will be a stopover on his way from Tokyo and Islamabad, America's two closest allies in Asia.

CHINESE MINING EXPERTS VISIT IRKUTSK

PM291347 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 29 Jul 83 p 4

[Report by VOSTOCHNO-SIBIRSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent A. Semenov: "Visit by PRC Experts"]

[Text] A delegation of PRC coal industry experts has been visiting the Soviet Union. In particular, they visited the Safronovskiy and Azeyskiy strip mines in Irkutsk Oblast and familiarized themselves with the operation of strip mines, fuel extraction techniques, and mining equipment.

When giving their impressions of what they had seen, the Chinese experts noted that the mines had been provided with a high level of powerful equipment which makes it possible to secure high labor productivity with fewer workers.

Delegation leader Zhang Changsong -- director of a company for developing China's coal industry -- advocated the continuation and development of contacts between Chinese and Soviet miners.

Quite a few Soviet experts worked in the PRC during the implementation of China's first 5-year plan in the fifties, he noted. Many Chinese students have studied in the USSR and are now real experts in their own sphere.

The guests were greatly impressed by the sanatoriums, preventive medicine clinics, rest homes, and hospitals for miners that they visited.

LATEST U.S. ARMS SALE TO TAIWAN CRITICIZED

OW301029 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0700 GMT 26 Jul 83

[Sergeyev commentary: "Infringement on China's Sovereignty"]

[Text] Dear listeners: The Chinese Government has lodged a strong protest with the U.S. Government against Washington's decision to sell \$530 million worth of weapons to the Taiwan authorities. This is the second huge arms deal between the United States and Taiwan after the signing of the Sino-U.S. Joint Communiqué on 17 August 1982. This transaction makes U.S. arms supplies to Taiwan in the current fiscal year larger in quantity than in the past several years.

It is noteworthy that the United States is providing Taiwan with new guided missiles, better in performance than those Taiwan now has that had not been sold to Taiwan before. This is an open violation of the U.S. commitments listed in the 17 August 1982 Joint Communiqué, i.e., that U.S. arms sales to Taiwan will not exceed, either in qualitative or quantitative terms, the level of those supplied in recent years after the establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States and China, and that the arms supplies to Taiwan will be gradually reduced. In this respect, station observer Sergeyev writes:

It is not strange that the U.S. policy evokes ever stronger protests from Beijing. Yet the people on the other side of the Pacific Ocean appear not to be paying any attention. Disregarding the 17 August 1982 Sino-U.S. agreement on gradually reducing U.S. arms supplies to Taiwan, the Reagan administration plans to provide Taiwan with approximately \$1.6 billion worth of arms in fiscal 1983-84, greatly exceeding the quantity supplied in previous several years.

The United States obdurately considers Taiwan an important U.S.-conceived NATO link in the Far East, with its spearhead directed against all socialist countries and national liberation movements in Asia. Therefore, the U.S. Administration plans to expand its military supplies to its Taiwan ally in the future as well. Although U.S. troops have been pulled out of Taiwan, the close military cooperation between the Pentagon and the Taiwan regime continues. Warships of the U.S. Seventh Fleet are still patrolling the Taiwan Strait, enjoying the right of entering the island's harbors freely, and virtually making these harbors their home base.

Facts show that the United States, as always, refuses to recognize the PRC's sovereignty over Taiwan and maintains full trade, economic, and other relations with Taiwan. Besides, the Taiwan Relations Act, passed by the U.S. Congress in early 1979, commits the United States to arming Taiwan and to protecting it from China's invasion. Ignoring China's protests, President Reagan constantly reaffirms that the United States will observe the Taiwan Relations Act and that it will not abandon its old friend and ally. In the U.S. Congress, advocates of the eventual seizure of Taiwan from China form a majority. They openly allege that a stable and prosperous Taiwan is vital to stability in the Far East and to U.S. national interests. In short, the United States is impudently and openly pursuing the policy of two Chinas in total disregard of China's national interests.

'FIRMNESS' OF USSR-KOREAN FRIENDSHIP NOTED

PM291523 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 27 Jul 83 p 3

[Vladimir Solovyev article under the rubric: "Commentator's Opinion": "Solidarity and Support"]

[Text] The month of solidarity with the Korean people's struggle for their country's peaceful and independent unification, held by decision of the WPC, ends today. Rallies, conferences, and meetings of working people have demonstrated the broad support of the public of all countries for the peace initiatives of the Workers Party of Korea and the DPRK Government aimed at creating a united independent Korea.

It is deeply symbolic that the end of the month coincides with a signal date in Korean history. Exactly 30 years ago, after unleashing armed aggression against the DPRK the U.S. imperialists and South Korean puppets were defeated and forced to sign a truce on 27 July 1953. The victory in the bloody 3-year war was a victory not only for the Korean people but also for all the peace-loving forces worldwide who demanded that the aggressors be halted. "In our country's darkest hour," Kim Il-song said in 1953, "by giving the Korean people enormous assistance and support and defending its rights and interests in the international arena, the Soviet Union, at the head of democratic forces the world over, inspired our people to wage a selfless struggle for a just cause and strengthened our people's faith in victory." The last three decades are convincing evidence of the firmness of the friendship of the two countries' peoples and of the Soviet Union's unfailing support for the Korean people's just struggle for their country's unification on the basis of national consolidation, peacefully and without any external interference.

On this day, when the people of the "Land of the Morning Calm" are celebrating the jubilee of the aggressors' rout, Soviet people wish the Korean people success in their struggle for their country's unification and for consolidating peace in the region, and for further achievements in socialist building.

REROUTING OF 'NEW JERSEY' PORT CALL ANALYZED

LD292303 Moscow TASS in English 1506 GMT 29 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 29 TASS -- News analyst Askold Biryukov writes: The command of the U.S. forces in Japan notified the National Defense Agency a few days ago that the modernised "veteran" of the Korean and Vietnam wars, the battleship "New Jersey" with Tomahawk cruise missile on board, will not call at one of the Japanese ports as initially planned. Why? The battleship at the head of one of the task forces of the U.S. Navy is now underway to the Pacific coast of Nicaragua against which Washington is preparing a large-scale aggression. Precisely, an aggression, and not some exercises as officially announced in Washington. But then, President Reagan's special envoy in Central America Richard Stone, talking to members of the bloodthirsty Salvadoran regime, did not bother to conceal the interventionist character of the decision to dispatch that and two other groups of U.S. naval ships to the Nicaraguan coast. He said that the U.S. flotilla off the coast of Central America could be used for an attack. It is only natural, therefore, that the planned call of the battleship "New Jersey" -- one of the ships dispatched by the United States thousands of miles from its territory to the coast of a foreign country for aggressive purposes -- was met with a sigh of relief in Japan. However, the newspaper YOMIURI notes that Tokyo hoped in conjunction with the planned calls of "New Jersey" (armed with Tomahawk missiles carrying conventional warheads -- for now) at Japanese calls [as received] in August that the Japanese people will develop a kind of tolerance to the stay of that ship in the territorial waters of the country.

Now, as the Nicaraguan mission of New Jersey may take months to accomplish, it is highly probable that the USA may request permission for the call of the battleship at Japan next spring, this time with nuclear weapons aboard, as it is planned to fit out Tomahawk cruise missiles carried by U.S. naval ships in the Pacific with nuclear warheads beginning in 1984. If so, the Japanese authorities will hardly escape so-called preliminary consultations with Washington which to this date has managed to do without them when U.S. nuclear-armed ships called at Japan's ports. It is only to be guessed what the outcome of the consultations and the political fallout for the official circles may be, especially with the parliamentary elections ahead....

But if the calls of U.S. nuclear-armed ships at Japanese ports are a headache for the official circles, they long have ceased to be a problem for Washington. The newspaper SANKEI SHIMBUN today runs a new interview with former U.S. Ambassador to Japan Edwin Reischauer who said openly that in the 1970's-1980's U.S. nuclear systems were transported through Japan's territorial waters and carried into its ports. The ex-diplomat said with the arrogance so characteristic of U.S. officials that these were lawful actions in accordance with an agreement between the governments of the two countries. He added it was high time the Government of Japan had given exhaustive explanations to the general public concerning the existence of such an agreement and the real situation with nuclear weapons. True, it is high time the Japanese authorities explained to the people of Japan why a situation exists whereby with a tacit official approval Japan is being turned into a depot of U.S. nuclear weapons directed against neighboring countries.

PEACE MARCHES SEEK TO PREVENT ANOTHER HIROSHIMA

OW290953 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 27 Jul 83

[Aleksey Andreyev commentary]

[Excerpts] The 38th anniversary of the tragic event of the U.S. Air Force's dropping of atomic bombs on two Japanese cities -- Hiroshima and Nagasaki -- will be commemorated on 6 August throughout the world. In this regard, Radio Moscow's commentator Aleksey Andreyev writes: Since early July millions of fighters for peace have joined in mass movements on all continents under slogans calling for no more Hiroshima and Nagasaki, stopping the arms race, and banning nuclear weapons. Reports have arrived daily about peace marches in various cities and prefectures in Japan with participants numbering tens of thousands. Peace marches that started in Sapporo, Naha, Tokyo, Osaka, Kitakyushu, and Takamatsu have now neared Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The campaign for peace and against nuclear weapons launched by the Japanese fighters this year is characterized by several points.

First, it indicates an understanding of the realistic threat and serious danger to Japan and all mankind posed by the current U.S. Government policy that is tantamount to preparations for nuclear war. A growing number of Japanese people have now come to realize that Japan's blind submission to the aggressive American policy is fraught with serious consequences.

The Japanese Government has agreed that American nuclear aircraft carriers and submarines may call at Japanese ports and that the F-16 fighter-bombers capable of carrying nuclear weapons may be deployed at the Misawa Base. This, of course, has aroused concerns. Japanese papers regard these measures as an actual step toward turning Japan into the theater of future nuclear wars. The plans to turn Japan into an unsinkable aircraft carrier are now in progress under the false pretext of the Soviet threat. On the other hand, propaganda organs of the bourgeoisie have not mentioned the Soviet peace proposals. Furthermore, the latest Soviet peace proposal, made at the plenary session of the Supreme Soviet in June, calls on all nuclear states to freeze both qualitatively and quantitatively all the existing nuclear weapons.

How did the United States and its allies, including Japan, respond to this proposal? They decided to deploy American cruise and Pershing II missiles in Western Europe this year. At the Williamsburg summit of seven nations, Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone voiced his support for this decision and thereby indicated that Japan approves of a new stage in the arms race. It was precisely to justify this support that nothing has been mentioned about the Soviet peace proposals. On the other hand, it is extensively known that Prime Minister Nakasone has made such irresponsible remarks as "turning Japan into an unsinkable aircraft carrier" and "dispatching Japanese vessels to blockade international straits." All his statements have naturally been criticized by the vast public in Japan.

The leaflets handed out by the peace marchers say that to strengthen peace we should start in our own country; then the forces of thousands of antiwar and antinuclear movements will be merged into one to prevent the pressing danger. No other words can better express the determination of the public opinions in Japan to perpetuate peace and to prevent the recurrence of the tragedies at Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

JAPANESE TRADE UNIONS COUNCIL OPENS CONGRESS

LD252044 Moscow TASS in English 1928 GMT 25 Jul 83

[Text] TOKYO July 25 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vasily Golovnin reports:

The congress of the General Council of Trade Unions of Japan, uniting in its ranks more than 4,550 thousand factory and office workers of that country, has opened here today under the slogans of struggle for the rights of the working people, against the onset of the forces of reaction and militarism. In the course of four days the delegates to the congress are to discuss and endorse a programme for actions for the coming year and elect a new leadership of that biggest trade union confederation of Japan.

Addressing the opening session of the congress, Motofumi Makieda, the chairman of the General Council of Trade Unions, strongly criticised the dangerous policy of the Yasuhiro Nakasone cabinet, which is strengthening the military alliance with Washington and is further drawing the country into the Reagan administration's nuclear strategy. The forthcoming calls at the ports of Japan of the U.S. nuclear powered aircraft carrier "Carl Vinson" and the modernized battleship "New Jersey" with Tomahawk cruise missiles on board are designed to lay the groundwork for the deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles on our country's territory, Motofumi Makieda stressed. This policy of Tokyo and Washington, the chairman of the General Council said, jeopardizes peace and Japan's security. Touching upon foreign policy problems, Makieda pointed to the need for strengthening the unit of various contingents of the working class and overcoming the divisions among the ranks of opposition in the interests of the common struggle against the reactionary policy of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party and big business.

As is pointed out in the press, the current congress is being held in a period that is extremely difficult for the country's trade union movement. Against the background of deepening economic depression and an acute financial crisis, the employers and the government are carrying out the policy of mass dismissals, of a freeze and actual cut in the pay, strive to split and weaken the ranks of the working class. Simultaneously the right wing in the trade union movement, which is trying to distract it from active struggle and isolate left-wing workers' organizations, has sharply intensified its activities. As a result of the joint offensive of the authorities, big business, and reformists, the traditional spring offensive of the working people this year has failed to achieve a number of objectives which it set to itself. In these conditions the left-wing trade unions incorporated into the general council demand that a rebuff be given to right-wing conciliators, declare for outlining new effective tactics for the working class movement, for lending it a more militant class character.

FRANCE SEEN INCREASING NATO INTEGRATION, MILITARY

LD272332 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1840 GMT 27 Jul 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Georgiy Zubakov]

[Text] France has carried out another nuclear test on Mururoa Atoll in the southern Pacific. France is persistently continuing to improve and increase its armed forces, above all their nuclear arsenal. I will quote an excerpt from an article in THE WASHINGTON POST concerning relations between France and NATO. It says: The day is not far away when many NATO documents will no longer need to be stamped Secret for fear that the French will take offense if they find out that it is being taken for granted that their armed forces will be regarded as part of the overall NATO might. Yes, that is already being taken for granted. Therefore, the following statements can appear in the commentaries of U.S. newspapers, such as THE WASHINGTON POST: White House and Pentagon officials are clucking excitedly in delight over what they are already calling France's return to NATO. This is undoubtedly a slightly hasty conclusion. But there are persuasive signs that under Mitterrand, France is willing to undertake a larger share of the burden of defending Western Europe and to discuss ways of integrating itself within the NATO Command.

The number of these signs has increased recently. One may recall that France's 5-year military program officially admits that the safeguarding of West Europe's security is closely bound up with the safeguarding of U.S. security, that, to put it more simply, Washington and Paris must act together. Events show that such a view does not remain on paper alone, by any stretch of the imagination. An example of this is the creation, along American lines, of French rapid deployment forces. France supports the plan for the deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles in Western Europe if proper success is not achieved at the Geneva talks. Finally, how can one forget that a meeting of the NATO Council was held 2 months ago in Paris? It was the first to be held there for 17 years, since France withdrew from NATO's military organization in 1966, under the government of General De Gaulle, and expelled its headquarters, which was located in Paris.

France currently has 98 nuclear missiles, of which 80 are deployed on 5 submarines and 18 in launch silos on the Plateau d'Albion in the south of the country. France's military program envisages a substantial increase in the country's nuclear forces. By 1995 France intends to increase the number of missiles on its submarines to 212 and to increase the number of submarines from 5 to 7. How stubbornly unwilling Washington and NATO are to count the nuclear forces of Britain and France in the total number of NATO nuclear armaments in Western Europe. But how can one not count these present and future submarines and missiles? Let us recall that France now has 98 missiles; Britain has 64. That makes a total of 162 missiles with 290 nuclear warheads.

PCF STANCE ON FRENCH MISSILES REVIEWED

LD312219 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 31 Jul 83

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] An interview by Georges Marchais, general secretary of the French Communist Party [PCF], published by the weekly TEMOIGNAGE CHRETIEN is devoted to the analysis of a number of trends in the French Government's foreign and domestic policies.

Touching upon the problem of nuclear weapons in Europe, he stressed, among other things, that the stance of the French Government, which opposes including French nuclear forces in the overall balance of NATO armaments, is contradictory.

Marchais pointed out: The PCF believes that in resolving the question of measures to reduce medium-range nuclear means, it is necessary to take into account all armaments of this type. It is no secret to anyone that the French nuclear missiles are intended for striking a blow against the territory of the USSR.

In this situation the Soviet Union's demand that French nuclear means be taken into consideration at the nuclear arms limitation talks is justified.

The PCF general secretary noted that the government's stance on this issue, as well as on certain other disarmament problems, does not correspond to the principles defined in the joint program worked out by the left-wing parties in preparation for the 1981 presidential elections.

Analysing Soviet-French relations, Marchais pointed out the need for the French Government to adopt specific measures to develop cooperation between the two countries.

Dwelling on internal political problems, the PCF general secretary stressed that on the whole, the Communist Party positively assesses the government's activities. However, the country's present economic situation confirms that there were miscalculations in the analysis of difficulties resulting from the policies of the former government of right-wing parties.

The PCF fully supports the main tasks of the government program aimed at combatting unemployment and reducing the rate of inflation and the foreign trade deficit. However, the PCF considers that these aims cannot be achieved at the expense of the interests of the working people.

Marchais also pointed out that the PCF will continue to actively contribute to the successful implementation of the joint program of the left-wing parties, which was approved by the majority of the French in the 1981 presidential elections.

PCF DELEGATION VISIT TO UZBEKISTAN NOTED

GF271515 Tashkent International Service in Uzbek 1700 GMT 25 Jul 83

[Text] A delegation representing the French Communist Party arrived in Tashkent, the capital of Uzbek SSR, on 25 July. Among the representatives are members of the French Communist Party Central Committee and secretaries of party organs.

The guests from France will remain in Uzbekistan for a few days. Currently they are acquainting themselves with new establishments in Tashkent. They will visit industrial factories and familiarize themselves with work in Uzbekistan, in addition to acquainting themselves with the work and living conditions of Uzbek workers. They will also visit Samarkand, which is known for its historic monuments.

PORTUGAL-U.S. NEGOTIATIONS ON AIRBASES SUSPENDED

LD261416 Moscow TASS in English 1407 GMT 26 Jul 83

[Text] Lisbon July 26 TASS -- A suspension of Portuguese-U.S. talks on extending the U.S. lease of the air force base Lajes on the Island of Terceira (the Azores archipelago) has been announced here. The Portuguese Foreign Ministry said in a statement on this occasion that it would be premature to set a date for the conclusion of the negotiations because there are still many -- and in some cases significant -- issues unresolved.

According to the news agency NOTICIAS DE PORTUGAL, one of the points of difference in the talks was over the accountability of Americans at the base to local courts. The same point of controversy arose also during recent Greek-U.S. talks on U.S. military bases in Greece.

The Lajes base has been used on more than one occasion for airlifting U.S. troops to the Middle East and other "trouble spots". Washington is now insisting on expanding and modernising the base. Plans provide, in particular, for installing more advanced radar equipment there and increasing the number of the military personnel at the base, which already has 2,000 servicemen billeted there, even further. According to the local press, it is not ruled out that the United States is seeking to obtain the right to use the base for airlifting its interventionist "Rapid Deployment Force" armed with nuclear weapons to Europe, the Middle East and the Persian Gulf zone.

London July 26 TASS -- The United States, the newspaper GUARDIAN said today, was bringing pressure to bear on Portugal in a bid to get permission to build more U.S. military bases for the "Rapid Deployment Force" also in the inland part of that country.

U.S. SPECIAL ENVOY MCFARLANE BEGINS MIDEAST TOUR

Tour Previewed

PM291603 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 29 Jul 83 First Edition p 4

[G. Musayelyan "Commentary": "Washington's Lebanese Gambit"]

[Text] In chess an opening is called a gambit when one side usually sacrifices a pawn to gain the initiative. In political gambits, far more significant pieces are removed from the board. The latest evidence of that is provided by the dismissal of P. Habib, architect of the Lebanese-Israeli "peace agreement" and President Reagan's special representative in the Near East. Quite recently Washington nominated him for a Nobel prize, but has now made him the "scapegoat" for the crisis in U.S. policy in the region.

As CBS-TV stresses, this move by R. Reagan is nothing other than a "desperate attempt by the White House to get its derailed Near East policy back on course." Recent events have shown that the majority of Arab states rejects the path of capitulatory deals with Tel Aviv onto which the United States is trying to push them. There has been particular condemnation of the so-called "Lebanese-Israeli peace agreement" concluded under Washington's auspices. That agreement is aimed at infringing Lebanon's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Behind official Washington's hypocritical expatiations the Arab peoples can see U.S. attempts to consolidate its own military presence in the region and to establish supremacy over it. After all, it is with direct U.S. support that Israel, America's closest ally, has been continuing to occupy a considerable part of the territory of Lebanon and other Arab countries in contravention of all international norms.

Political observers note that the Near East states want a settlement that would take into account the interests of all the Arab peoples and which would not legitimize the U.S.-Israeli tyranny in this region. But the latter is essentially and precisely what Habib strove for in pursuing the Reagan administration's line. Thus the Near East deadlock can only be overcome via consideration of the legitimate interests of all the peoples of the region including the Palestinian Arab people. The issues cannot be resolved by "shuttle diplomacy" or by attempts to split Arab unity and weaken the united action front -- these cannot be crowned with success.

It should be noted that Tel Aviv was not sitting idly by while Washington was looking around for its latest gambit piece. Tel Aviv has spawned another expansionist idea -- the plan for the "redeployment" of the Israeli troops in Lebanon, which is expected to take 5 months. Essentially they are to leave the Ash-Shuf mountain region and concentrate in southern Lebanon. As for the aggressors' contingents in Al-Biq'a', nothing will change there.

Can it be that the occupiers really intend to withdraw their troops from a part of the captured lands? Not at all. "Israel," AP points out, "regards the question of the redeployment of its subunits in Lebanon from the viewpoint of reducing human and material losses."

According to clearly understated official Israeli figures, over 160 officers and men have been killed by guerrillas in Lebanon since last September. The number of wounded runs into many hundreds. The continuing aggression has already cost Tel Aviv \$1.5 billion. This is exacerbating Israel's already difficult economic situation and causing discontent among its public.

It was to stifle the discontent and facilitate U.S. and Israeli diplomatic maneuvering in the Near East that Habib was removed from his post. His replacement is Robert McFarlane.

The 46-old-year McFarlane is not considered an expert on Near East problems. However, at certain stages in his career he has worked in that sphere as, for example, executive officer of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in 1968-1971; as military assistant to H. Kissinger, then the President's national security adviser, in the White House in 1973-1975; and also from January 1981 to January 1982 when he was a State Department adviser. According to the account of National Security Council staffers, he was recommended for the State Department post by the superhawk A. Haig, then secretary of state, and in the main carried out the latter's confidential assignments in Israel, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Oman, and Egypt.

McFarlane has announced his intention to visit the capitals of the main Near East countries at the end of this month. The aim is to study the measures that should be taken in the future to resolve the Lebanon problem and to broaden the peace settlement process in the region.

The main target of McFarlane's trip will be Syria, which has refused to withdraw its troops from Lebanon at the same time as the Israeli subunits withdrew, as envisaged by the U.S.-mediated agreement concluded between Israel and Lebanon. In mid-May, Syrian President H. Al-Asad rejected the proposed visit to that country by P. Habib for a discussion of the prevailing situation. As a White House spokesman asserts, President H. al-Asad "will not be opposed to a visit by McFarlane, a former marine officer who is inclined toward blunt speaking." Without commenting on that statement, let us simply note that the Arab east knows the U.S. Marines very well. And their unsavory role in Lebanon, where they are acting as accomplices to aggression, is further confirmation of that.

Arrives in Beirut

LD011102 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 1 Aug 83

[Text] McFarlane, special envoy of the U.S. President, has arrived in Beirut. Lebanon is the first stage of the new White House emissary's tour of the Near East. He will visit also Syria, Israel, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Jordan. According to observers, the U.S. representative will make a new attempt to implement the agreement with Israel imposed on Lebanon and encroaching upon this country's sovereignty.

PLO OFFICIAL ON CONTINUED SOVIET SUPPORT

LD301946 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 30 Jul 83

[Interview with Jamal as-Surani, member of the PLO Executive Committee, by correspondent (Andre Chetikov), date and place not given]

[Text] [Chetikov] Dear friends, [words indistinct] with Comrade Jamal as-Surani, member of the PLO Executive Committee and secretary general of the Palestinian [words indistinct]. The tension has greatly increased in the Middle East as result of the continuation of the Israeli aggression against the Palestinian people and the Arab peoples. This happened with the support of Washington and as a result of the efforts to impose upon them opportunistic bargains which ignore the legitimate rights and interests of the Arabs. What is your opinion as a lawyer concerning [words indistinct] in the region?

[As-Surani] After the withdrawal of the Palestinian forces, the Palestinian popular resistance continued, is still continuing, and will continue.

America is supplying Israel with all that could be supplied of armament, equipment, money and even with political protection in international forums, especially the UN General Assembly and the Security Council. The United States has ignored Security Council Resolutions 508 and 509, which order the complete and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all the Lebanese territories. It imposed upon Lebanon an agreement which makes Lebanon a satellite of Israel, with all that the word satellite implies: a political, economic and military satellite. It makes the skies of Lebanon, [words indistinct] of Lebanon and the territories of Lebanon a theatre for the Israeli Army.

[Chetikov] Soviet social circles are in complete agreement with the course of the CPSU which is aimed at a just and comprehensive solution for the Middle East issue, and supports the brave Palestinian Arab people in their struggle for their legitimate rights, including the establishment of their national independent state. What is your estimation of the contribution of the Soviet people in the struggle to solve the Palestinian issue and the Middle East issue in general?

[As-Surani] The Soviet Union was always on the side of the Palestinian people. The relation between the Soviet Union and the Palestinian people and the Arab nation, as we see it in the PLO is a [word indistinct] relation, a stable and comprehensive relation, a continuous relation, it is not a temporary relation, and it is not a tactical relations. We are for the growth and strengthening of this relation between the Soviet Union and the Palestinian people and the Arab people, because the Soviet Union, through the huge aid which it gives and which it will give in the future, will help the Arab countries to defend themselves, and will help them [words indistinct] and will help the Palestinian people to achieve their rights and to return to Palestine, and gain self-determination and establish their state under the leadership of the PLO, which is opposed by the United States. From this we find that we and the Soviet Union are in one trench, while America and Israel are in the opposite trench.

U.S. PLANS FOR BRIGHT STAR EXERCISES OUTLINED

LD302246 Moscow TASS in English 2055 GMT 30 Jul 83

[Text] New York July 30 TASS -- Units of the interventionist U.S. Rapid Deployment Force (RDF) have begun preparations for large-scale exercises Bright Star-83 to be held in Egypt, Sudan, Somalia and Oman.

According to a UPI report, officially the exercises are to be held on August 10-September 10. However, U.S. troops will begin arriving in Egypt August 1, under the pretext of adjusting to the local climate. A spokesman for the Pentagon said that the exercises involving Egyptian troops are designed to determine the capabilities of the forces taking part in them, to practice their teamwork under field conditions, and to try out new military concepts. A U.S. aircraft carrier force is to be dispatched to the Egyptian coast during the exercises.

In Sudan the exercises include an air landing, in Somalia approximately 2,800 U.S. Marines together with Somalian troops will stage a practice amphibious landing and a series of land operations. The planes of the U.S. Marine Corps will practice techniques of providing air cover for an amphibious landing operation. Air force exercises are to be in Oman.

Observers note that the holding of one-month-long joint military exercises in the Middle East reflects the striving of the Pentagon to build up its presence in that strategically important region.

SOVIET-ETHIOPIAN COOPERATION PROTOCOL SIGNED

PM280927 Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 30, Jul 83 (Signed to Press 18 Jul 83) p 21

[Unattributed article under the rubric "Foreign Economic Ties": "On a Long-Term Basis"]

[Text] A routine session of the Soviet-Ethiopian intergovernmental Commission for Economic, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation and trade was held in Moscow 4-12 July.

Questions relating to the implementation of existing intergovernmental agreements on cooperation in the construction in socialist Ethiopia of a number of installations in various spheres of the economy, and to trade between the two countries were discussed.

Prospects for developing economic relations, including cooperation in the sphere of geology and mining, power engineering, industry, planning, and training, were examined.

A protocol and other intergovernmental documents were signed on the results of the commission's work. They were signed by Ya. P. Ryabov, chairman of the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, and Ethiopian Industry Minister Hailu Yemanu.

The commission's work will help to further expand and deepen equitable and mutually advantageous Soviet-Ethiopian cooperation in the economic and trade sphere on a stable and long-term basis.

SUDANESE AMBASSADOR DEPARTS FROM USSR 22 JUL

PM271454 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Jul 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Ambassador's Departure"]

[Text] Hasan al-Amin al-Bashir, the ambassador of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan to the USSR, left Moscow 22 July.

ANGOLA'S JORGE RECEIVES AAPSO DELEGATION

LD301955 Moscow TASS in English 1627 GMT 30 Jul 83

[Text] Luanda July 30 TASS -- The constructive Soviet initiatives in the field of limiting the arms race are aimed at ensuring lasting peace on earth, stated Paulo Jorge, member of the Central Committee of the MPLA-Workers Party, minister of foreign affairs of the Peoples Republic of Angola (PRA). He received a delegation of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, visiting here.

The Angolan minister expressed striving for further development of friendly relations between the USSR and the PRA, the relations which are firmly based on the unity of the sides views on major international matters. He spoke highly of the activities of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee and of the Angolan League for Friendship With the Peoples of Foreign Countries, aimed at strengthening Soviet-Angolan friendship and at stepping up struggle against the forces of imperialism, racism, and reaction.

Paulo Jorge firmly condemned the Reagan administration's policy which hinders the efforts aimed at averting the threat of a nuclear war and which undermines a settlement of the situation in the African Continent's south.

PONOMAREV, NICARAGUAN MINISTER DISCUSS C. AMERICA

LD291705 Moscow TASS in English 1631 GMT 29 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 29 TASS -- Alternate Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Boris Ponomarev, and Deputy Head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee Karen Brutents met today with member of the Political Commission of the national leadership of the Sandinist Front of National Liberation of Nicaragua, Minister of Agricultural Development and Agrarian Reform, Commandante of the Revolution Jaime Wheelock, who is staying in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Ministry of Agriculture of the USSR.

During the conversation, which passed in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding, views were exchanged on some questions of the international situation, first of all the situation in Central America and around Nicaragua. The participants in the meeting firmly condemned the aggressive, militaristic actions of the United States imperialist circles in Central America, which are whipping up tension in that region, their policy of rude pressure, blackmail, and threats in respect of Nicaragua. Expressed from the Soviet side was the consistent solidarity of the CPSU with the just struggle of the Nicaraguan people in defence of the country's sovereignty and national independence, in defence of its revolutionary gains and its sacred right to shape its own destiny itself.

The participants in the meeting stressed the importance of the constructive proposals made by the leadership of the Sandinist National Liberation Movement directed at a peaceful, political solution by way of talks of the situation that has arisen in Central America.

U.S. 'INVENTS' SOVIET WEAPONS FOR NICARAGUA

LD311815 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 31 Jul 83

[Text] Nicaragua's port authorities have rejected President Reagan's and American media inventions about Soviet arms supplies to that Central American nation. They said Soviet ships heading for Nicaraguan ports or getting unloaded there had exclusively civilian cargoes on board. The authorities invited foreign newsmen to watch the unloading of the Soviet freighter "Aleksandr Ulyanov" at the port of Corinto. It is believed that Washington has invented a Soviet weapons for Nicaragua problem to try to justify its preparations to invade Nicaragua for its refusal to bow to American pressure.

CPSU'S GORBACHEV RECEIVES CUBAN CP DELEGATION

PM290845 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jul 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Exchange of Experience"]

[Text] A delegation of Communist Party of Cuba [PCC] workers headed by J. Rizo, member of the PCC Central Committee Secretariat, was in the Soviet Union 17 through 25 July under the CPSU-PCC interparty ties plan.

The Cuban friends familiarized themselves with the CPSU party organizations' experience of work in the leadership of agricultural development. During their stay in our country they had meetings and talks in the CPSU Central Committee Agriculture and Food Industry Department, the CPSU Moscow Obkom and Krasnodar Kraykom, ministries and departments, and they visited a number of agricultural enterprises and scientific research institutions.

The delegation was received by M.S. Gorbachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who had a warm, friendly talk with the delegation. Taking part in the talks were CPSU Central Committee members V.A. Karlov, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Agriculture and Food Industry Department, and I.A. Sakhnyuk, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Agricultural Machine Building Department, as well as R. Anillo, Cuban ambassador to the USSR.

RYZHKOVS RECEIVES CUBAN YOUNG COMMUNIST CHIEF

PM241427 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jul 83 p 1

[TASS report: "Meeting at CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] On 20 July N.I. Ryzhkov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received representatives of a delegation of the Cuban Union of Young Communists [UJC] headed by C. Lage, first secretary of the UJC National Committee. The delegation is in the Soviet Union to take part in the Third Festival of Friendship between the youth of the USSR and the Republic of Cuba.

In the course of the conversation questions were touched upon relating to the further development of cooperation between the Lenin Komsomol and the UJC, and to young people's participation in socialist and communist building and the struggle for peace and against the threat of war.

Taking part in the meeting were I. Tapanes, chief of the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee Communications and Transport Sector; V.M. Mishin, first secretary of the All-Union Lenin Komsomol Central Committee; and Cuban Ambassador to the USSR R. Anillo Capote.

CUBA'S CALDERIO AWARDED OCTOBER REVOLUTION ORDER

LD240206 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1277 GMT 23 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow, 23 Jul (TASS) -- Blas Roca Calderio, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba and vice president of the Council of State of the Republic of Cuba, has been awarded the Soviet Order of the October Revolution.

He receives this award for great services to the development of fraternal friendship and all-round cooperation between the USSR and the Republic of Cuba and in connection with his 75th birthday.

EL SALVADOR'S AGRARIAN REFORM 'FAILURE'

LD300245 Moscow TASS in English 2149 GMT 29 Jul 83

[Text] Washington July 29 TASS -- The agrarian reform in El Salvador which was so pompously described by the Reagan administration as an "accomplishment" on the road of "democratisation" of the Salvadorean regime, has suffered a failure. The patent evidence of that are the data printed by the International Development Agency. The data show that peasants who got the formal right to have small plots of land, leased by them from big landowners, indeed cannot use them. About 10,000 peasants were driven away from the land they tilled over the time that passed since the announcement of the "reform" in 1980. It is indicative that land barons broadly use soldiers to deal with peasants.

The data of the International Development Agency refute President Reagan's statement made last week on some mythical progress in putting into life the agrarian reform in El Salvador.

As is noted by the American Press, Reagan made that statement only to get approval of Congress for continuation of the American military-economic aid to the Salvadoran military.

SHITIKOV RECEIVES MEXICAN PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION

LD282332 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 28 Jul 83

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] A delegation from the Mexican National Congress arrived in Moscow today for an official visit at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet. It is led by Danton Rodriguez, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Chamber of Deputies.

The guests visited the USSR Supreme Soviet today. The guests were cordially welcomed by Comrade Shitikov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet. During a friendly conversation both sides expressed their confidence that the delegation's visit to the Soviet Union will serve to further expand parliamentary links and cooperation between the two countries.

Delegation Visits Azerbaijan

LD010124 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1830 GMT 31 Jul 83

[Text] A delegation of the Mexican Congress led by Danton Rodriguez, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Congress's Chamber of Deputies, today completed the program for its visit to Azerbaijan with a trip to Neftyanoye Kamni, an oilfield town in the open sea. The Mexican parliamentarians are in the Soviet Union on an official visit at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

PRAVDA NOTES SOVIET-ARGENTINE COOPERATION TALKS

PM271156 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jul 83 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Relations Developing"]

[Text] On 21 July USSR Foreign Trade Minister N.S. Patolichev received A. Guadagni, Argentine secretary of state for energy and head of the Argentine delegation at the seventh session of the Soviet-Argentine Mixed Commission for Commercial Economic Scientific and Technical Cooperation.

During the talks, which took place in a friendly atmosphere, it was pointed out that Soviet-Argentine trade relations, which are based on the principles of equal rights and mutual advantage, are developing successfully. There was an exchange of opinions on the prospects for the further development of mutual trade.

USSR MARKS 80TH RSDLP CONGRESS ANNIVERSARY

Andropov Attends Meeting

LD291436 Moscow TASS in English 1322 GMT 29 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 29 TASS -- A celebration meeting on the occasion of the 80th anniversary of the Second R.S.D.L.P. [Russian Social Democratic Labor Party] Congress has been held in Moscow today. It was attended by representatives of the working class of Moscow, of the working people of the Moscow region, veteran members of the Leninist party, scientists and workers in culture, and Soviet Army men. Also present were the heads of diplomatic representations of the socialist countries.

In the presidium of the celebration meeting were Yuriy Andropov, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and other Soviet leaders. Together with them in the presidium were Le Duan, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist party of Vietnam, Tum Aagiyn Tsendenbal, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, chairman of the presidium of the People's Great Hural of the Mongolian People's Republic.

A report on the subject "The Party of Revolutionary Action" has been delivered by Mikhail Zimyanin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The celebration meeting ended with the singing of the party anthem "The Internationale."

Variant TASS Report

LD291615 Moscow TASS in English 1538 GMT 29 Jul 83

["Celebration Meeting on the occasion of the 80th anniversary of the Second Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party" -- TASS Headline]

[Text] Moscow July 29 TASS -- A celebration meeting devoted to the 80th anniversary of the Second Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party took place in Moscow today. It was attended by representatives of the working class of the capital, workers from the Moscow region, veteran members of the Leninist Party, scientists, workers in culture, and servicemen of the Soviet Armed Forces. There also were at the meeting heads of the diplomatic missions of socialist countries.

There sat in the presidium of the celebration meeting Geydar Aliyev, Mikhail Gorbachev, Grigoriy Romanov, Dmitriy Ustinov, Vitaliy Vorotnikov, Boris Ponomarev, Mikhail Zimyanin, Konstantin Rusakov, Nikolay Ryzhkov, and also Le Duan, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam, and Yumjaagiyn Tsedenbal, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party and chairman of the Presidium of the Great People's Hural of the Mongolian People's Republic.

The honorary presidium consisting of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee with Yuriy Andropov at its head was enthusiastically elected.

The report entitled "Party of Revolutionary Action" was delivered by Mikhail Zimyanin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The celebration meeting ended with the singing of the party anthem Internationale.

PRAVDA Reports Meeting

PM011110 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jul 83 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Along the Path Outlined by Lenin: Ceremonial Meeting in the Kremlin"]

[Text] Today Communists and all the progressive public of our planet are looking back to the source of Lenin's party -- the Second Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Workers Party. It is 8 decades since it completed the unification of Russia's revolutionary Marxist organizations on the ideological, political, and organizational principles put forward by V.I. Lenin. The leader's ideas, which were given real embodiment at the congress in the creation of the party of socialist revolution, were and remain the foundation on which the CPSU is developing and the world communist movement is strengthening. The gigantic activity of the new type of party -- the party of Bolsheviks -- paved the way for a new era in the history of mankind and laid the foundation for a new communist civilization.

The great Leninist party has been selflessly serving the cause of peace and communism for decades; creatively developing Marxist-Leninist theory and constantly strengthening links with the masses, it is confidently paving the way to a new life. Our country, which has built a developed socialist society under the leadership of the CPSU and which is part of the world system of socialism, is confidently following the path outlined by the great Lenin. The source of the invincibility of Soviet society and the further flourishing of the socialist motherland was and remains the unbreakable unity of the party and the people.

The CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum stressed once again that the main point and basic content of the party's activity is concern for Soviet man, for improving his life, for his all-around development, and for creating peaceful conditions for the creation of communism. There is nothing more important for the CPSU than to preserve peace and avert a new world war.

A ceremonial meeting of party, soviet, and public organizations and representatives of Moscow's working people to mark the 80th anniversary of the Second Russian Social Democratic Workers Party Congress was held 29 July in the Great Kremlin Palace in Moscow. The hall contained representatives of the capital's working class, workers from the surrounding area, party veterans, scientists, cultural figures, and Soviet Army servicemen. The heads of the socialist countries' diplomatic missions were present.

The participants in the ceremonial meeting greeted the following comrades with prolonged applause: G.A. Aliyev, M.S. Gorbachev, G.V. Romanov, D.F. Ustinov, V.I. Vorotnikov, B.N. Ponomarev, M.V. Zimyanin, K.V. Rusakov, and N.I. Ryzhkov. Le Duan, general secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee, and Yu. Tsedenbal, general secretary of the MPRP Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the Mongolian People's Republic People's Great Hural, who were warmly greeted by those present, were also in the presidium, as well as veterans of the Leninist party; leaders of party, soviet, and public organizations; industrial and agricultural front-runners; prominent scientific and cultural figures; and military leaders.

The ceremonial meeting was opened by R.F. Dementyeva, secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom. An honorary presidium comprising the CPSU Central Committee Politburo headed by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov was elected with enthusiasm.

M.V. Zimyanin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was given the floor for a report entitled "Party of Revolutionary Action." The report was received attentively and with repeated applause.

The ceremonial meeting was declared closed. The hall resounded to the tune of the Internationale.

GOVERNMENT DECISIONS, APPOINTMENTS PUBLISHED

TASS 'Official Section'

PM291106 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jul 83 Morning Edition p 2

[TASS "Official Section"]

[Text] Fuel for Winter

The USSR Council of Ministers has adopted a resolution "On Providing the National Economy and the Population with Fuel, Electricity, and Thermal Power in the 1983-1984 Fall-Winter Period."

USSR ministries and departments and union republic Councils of Ministers are instructed, in particular:

To create, as of 1 October 1983 and 1 January 1984, stocks of coal and fuel oil in the quantities laid down by the resolution at power stations, associations, enterprises, and organizations, and to elaborate and implement measures to prepare them for uninterrupted work in the 1983-1984 fall-winter period.

To examine the progress at power stations, associations, enterprises, and organizations under their jurisdiction in fulfilling targets for saving fuel and power resources in 1983, and to elaborate and implement measures to eliminate factors causing overexpenditure of fuel and power in relation to the norms laid down and nonrational utilization and losses of these resources. Persons guilty of thriftless attitudes toward fuel and power utilization are to be called to account strictly.

To ensure the elaboration and implementation, before the onset of the 1983-1984 fall-winter period, at every association, enterprise, and organization under their jurisdiction, of measures to reduce losses of thermal power, including measures to impose order in heating networks, heating, ventilation, and fuel supply systems, and systems for heating residential, production, and public buildings; to regulate heating systems with a view to eliminating the overheating of individual premises, and to reduce the temperature in production and public buildings during nonworking time.

To ensure the procurement in 1983 of local types of fuel in the quantities necessary to ensure uninterrupted supplies to the population, as well as the timely shipment of fuel to the trading organizations' stores. Union republic Councils of Ministers must adopt measures to improve the organization of fuel deliveries to the population using centralized transport.

The resolution provides for measures to supply the fuel requirements of the national economy and the population in the second half of 1983 using supplementary fuel resources.

Targets are set for the loading and shipment of fuel cargos, the construction of individual sections of gas pipelines, electricity transmission lines, and railroads; and the supply of materials, machines, equipment, and spare parts to enterprises in the coal, gas, and oil industry.

The USSR Council of Ministers noted that the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry does not devote due attention to developing the production of graded coals and coal briquettes. Graded coal resources do not meet the population's demand or municipal and domestic needs, and for several years in succession the coal briquette production plan has not been fulfilled.

The USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry is instructed to draw up proposals for increasing the production of graded coals and coal briquettes in 1984-1985 and to take account of them in draft plans for the years in question.

The resolution also notes that in recent years the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification has permitted a considerable deterioration in the utilization of the national capacity of power stations working on solid fuel, as a result of which the volume of coal utilization falls and expenditure of fuel oil increases. The ministry is instructed to adopt measures to eliminate these shortcomings.

Increased Pensions

In accordance with a 30 June 1983 USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Decree, the USSR Council of Ministers has examined the question of extending the range of workers and employees with the right to a 20-percent increase in the old age pension for a continuous span of work at one enterprise (institution, organization) and adopted a corresponding resolution.

The resolution provides that the continuous span of work giving the right to an increase in the old age pension is defined in accordance with the rules for calculating a continuous work span for workers and employees when fixing state social insurance allowances approved by the USSR Council of Ministers resolution of 13 April 1973.

On this basis the above-mentioned continuous span of work will be defined not only in terms of the duration of the last job at one enterprise (institution, organization), as was laid down formerly, but will in certain cases also include the length of previous work at other enterprises (institutions, organizations), in particular where the transfer from one enterprise (institution, organization) to another takes place under a decision of party, soviet, and higher economic organs; the length of service in the USSR Armed Forces; and the length of training in vocational and technical schools. The continuous span of work will also be maintained where persons who have been working in the far north regions and have been dismissed from work on the expiry of the term of their labor contract enter a job within the time laid down.

Where a person is dismissed on his own request, these rules for maintaining the continuous span of work do not apply, with the exception of the cases of the dismissal of pregnant women or mothers with children aged 8 or under; dismissal in connection with the transfer of a husband or wife to work in another locality or retirement on old age or invalidity pension; and also dismissal in connection with a move to a job in another locality under the procedure of the organized recruitment of workers, agricultural resettlement, or social drafting. Nor is the continuous span of work maintained where a person is dismissed for reasons of violation of labor discipline or the commission of certain other culpable acts provided for by the rules.

The new, more advantageous procedure for calculating increases to the old age pension comes into force on 1 August 1983 and will apply in the fixing and recomputation of pensions for persons who were working on 1 January or later, except for pensioners who were working temporarily (less than 4 months).

Combining Posts in the Service Sphere

The USSR Council of Ministers has examined the question of bringing in workers to consumer services enterprises to work on the basis of combining posts [sovmestitelstvo].

Leaders of consumer services enterprises are granted the right to accept for work on a combined post basis engineers, technicians, and employees of enterprises, institutions, and organizations (regardless of the level of their wages at their main place of work) for to provide consumer services directly to the population, with no more than half the normal working time to be spent in the additional [sovmeshchayemaya] post.

Remuneration for labor in the additional post (job) is to be calculated on the basis of the salary (wage) laid down for that post (job) for the volume of work actually fulfilled (time worked). Combined post work is permitted only at one consumer service enterprise with written permission from the leader of the enterprise, institution, or organization at the main place of work by agreement with the trade union committee.

The USSR Council of Ministers also gives permission, regardless of wages, to pay the full pensions laid down in accordance with the law on pensions and allowances to members of kolkhozes and pensioners working with the consent of the kolkhozes in their free time from agricultural work as workers and foremen at consumer services enterprises.

For Health Care and the People's Education

The USSR Council of Ministers has adopted a resolution "On the Utilization of Resources Received as a Result of the Communist Subbotnik [voluntary Saturday work] held on 18 December 1982 in connection with the 60th anniversary of the USSR's formation." These resources are distributed as follows. The sum of R104.9 million is channeled into the construction in 1984-1987 of central rayon, children's, and city hospitals, hospitals for war and labor veterans, maternity homes, and general outpatient clinics, R48.8 million into the construction of general educational schools in 1984-1986; and R37.9 million into the construction of children's preschool institutions in 1984-1985.

Deputy Minister Appointments

PM291131 [Editorial Report] Moscow SOBRANIYE POSTANOVLENIY PRAVITELSTVA SOYUZA SOVETSKIKH SOTSIALISTICHESKIKH RESPUBLIK (Section 1) in Russian, No 14, 1983, carries on pages 251-255 the following USSR Council of Ministers resolutions:

dated 4 May, appointing A.Ye Donskikh first deputy minister of machine building for light and food industry and household appliances;

dated 6 May, relieving S.P. Kozyrev of his duties as USSR deputy foreign minister in connection with his retirement; appointing A.S. Shavreyev deputy minister of construction, road, and municipal machine building, and appointing I.A. Ordinartsev deputy minister of the machine tool and tool building industry and relieving N.I. Sergeyev of those duties in connection with his retirement;

dated 7 May, appointing V.A. Brezhnev first deputy minister and relieving him of his duties as deputy minister of transport construction, and relieving N.I. Litvin of his duties as first deputy minister in connection with his retirement;

dated 10 May, appointing Yu.V. Zhukov deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Prices and relieving A.T. Kuznetsov of those duties in connection with his retirement;

dated 10 May, appointing V.G. Chirskov first deputy minister and relieving him of his duties as deputy minister of the construction of petroleum and gas industry enterprises.

REPUBLIC PARTY CENTRAL COMMITTEES HOLD PLENUMS

Moldavian SSR

PM211420 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 6 Jul 83 p 1

["Information Report on Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] The 10th Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum was held in Kishinev 5 July.

The plenum examined the question "On the results of the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum and Republic Party Organizations' Tasks Arising From Its Decisions and the Speech Delivered at the Plenum by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee." The report at the plenum was delivered by Comrade S.K. Grossu, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee.

Taking part in the ensuing debate were Comrades V.K. Kiktenko, first secretary of Kishinev Party Gorkom; N.F. Bondarchuk, first secretary of Bendery party Gorkom; O.I. Konnikov, first secretary of Nisporenskiy Raykom; O.I. Lutokhina, fitter at the "Vibropribor" Production Association; N.A. Kutkovetskiy, of the Moldavian SSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting; G.M. Volkov, chairman of the Moldavian SSR Committee for State Security; V.D. Voda, general manager of Vulkaneshty's Moldvinprom Agroindustrial Association; V.I. Mastayev, first secretary of Bessarabskiy Raykom; N.A. Shtefanets, teacher at Zaykany Secondary School, Ryshkanskiy Rayon; P.P. Botsu, first secretary of the Moldavian SSR Writer's Union Board; A.S. Konstantinov, Moldavian SSR Minister of Culture; S.M. Parmakli, leader of a mechanized detachment at the Chadyr-Lungskiy Rayon Kolhoz council association for the mechanization and electrification of agricultural production; and V.V. Babi, first secretary of the Moldavian Komsomol Central Committee.

The plenum relieved Comrade M.A. Pleshko of his duties as editor of the Magazine KOMUNISTUL MOLDOVEY (MOLDAVIAN COMMUNIST) in connection with his retirement.

The plenum approved Comrade V.D. Danilenko as editor of the magazine KOMUNISTUL MOLDOVEY, relieving him of his duties as chief of the Moldavian CP Central Committee Culture Department.

The plenum approved Comrade Ye.V. Sobor as chief of the Moldavian CP Central Committee Culture Department.

Taking part in the plenum's work were CPSU Central Committee Inspector Comrade A.V. Romantsov and Comrade V.A. Nikitin, instructor of the CPSU Central Committee Party Organizational Work Department.

Tajik SSR

PM211357 Dushant. KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA in Russian 3 Jul 83 p 1

["Information Report on Tajik Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] The 10th Tajik Communist Party Central Committee Plenum was held 2 July 1983.

Taking part in its work were first secretaries of party gorkoms and raykoms who are not members of the Central Committee; secretaries of party obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms for ideological matter; leaders of republic ministries and departments; VUZ rectors and party committee secretaries; responsible workers from the apparatus of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee, the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium, and Council of Ministers; the Tajik Trade Union Council, and the Tajik Komsomol Central Committee; and workers from mass information and propaganda media.

The plenum examined the question "The Result of the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum and Republic Party Organizations' Tasks Stemming From the Plenum Resolutions and the Speech by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

A report on this question was delivered by Comrade R.N. Nabiyeu, first secretary of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee.

During the debate on the report speeches were delivered by Comrades R. Khodzhiyev, first secretary of the Leninabad party; Obkome G. Pallayev, first secretary of the Kurgan-Tyube party Obkom; M.Z. Zairov, first secretary of the Gorno-Badakhshan party Obkom; K.V. Sarychev, second secretary of the Kulyab party Obkom; Kh. Nazarova, team leader on Leninskiy Rayon's XII Partsyezd Sovkhoz; Sh.M. Sultanov, first secretary of the Tajik Komnomol Central Committee; T.N. Vereshchagina, weaver at the Dushanbe Cotton Textile Production Association; M.S. Asimov, president of the Tajikistan Academy of Sciences; B.A. Vasilyev, second secretary of the Dushanbe party Gorkom; R. Dadaboyev, Tajik SSR minister of Education; Khasanov, first secretary of the Ordzhonokidzeabad party Gorkom; V. Mamadov, chairman of the Tajik SSR DOSAAF Central Committee; and N. Tabarov, editor of the republic newspaper TOCHIKISTONI SOVETI.

The plenum adopted a corresponding resolution on the question under discussion.

The plenum examined an organizational question. In connection with Yu.A. Shakarimov's appointment as chairman of the Tajik SSR State Committee for 'Labor and Social Questions the plenum relieved him of duties as candidate member of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee Politburo.

Comrade Yu.N. Zhdanov, sector chief at the CPSU Central Committee International Information Department, also took part in the plenum's work.

With this the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee plenum concluded its work.

UZBEK SSR PARTY, GOVERNMENT BODIES CONVENE

Party Central Committee

PM281417 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jul 83 First Edition p 2

[Report by correspondents N. Gladkov and Yu. Mukimov under the rubric "Communists Discuss the Tasks of Fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum Decisions" and the general heading "Considering the Long Term": "Uzbekistan"]

[Text] Tashkent -- The shaping of the new man is a matter not only for ideological cadres. It is a matter for the entire party. That was the main idea at the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee Plenum which discussed the results of the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum and the republican party organization's tasks.

"The decisions of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum are a graphic new manifestation of the Communist Party's innovatory approach toward topical problems of ideological and mass-political work," said Sh. R. Rashidov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, who delivered the report. "They are a major contribution to the theory and practice of scientific communism, a model of an approach of Leninist wisdom toward the entire multiplicity of the problems set by the party. In his speech at the Plenum Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, examined profoundly and comprehensively the fundamental problems of communist ideology and education and gave an exhaustive analysis of the present stage of Soviet society's development, its historical prospects, and the internal and international factors which set new tasks in the ideological sphere."

The speakers noted that the Uzbek party organizations have stepped up their leadership of all sectors of ideological work in recent years. This has also helped economic successes. In the first two and one-half years of the 11th 5-Year Plan, there has been a substantial increase in the republic's production forces and industrial production growth and the output of consumer goods have been ensured at a rate above the plan targets. Agriculture is developing steadily and rapidly. The working people's spiritual life has become richer.

At the same time, as M. Musakhanov, first secretary of the Tashkent Obkom, Z. Rakhimbabayeva, Uzbek SSR minister of culture; Kh. Rustamova, team leader at the Ulyanov Sovkhoz, Dzhizak Oblast; Lieutenant General N. Moiseyev, chief of the Turkestan Military District Political Directorate; and others noted in their speeches, much has to be done to further improve ideological activity and to eliminate the shortcomings mentioned at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

An urgent requirement of the times is the struggle for a conscious labor and state discipline. The experience of enterprises like the Navoi Mining and Metallurgical Combine, the Tashkent Chkalov Aviation Production Association, the Voroshilov Tashselmash, the Surkhan Sovkhoz, Surkhandarya Oblast, and many others shows how important it is that every worker should have a profound awareness of the fact that the fulfillment of the projected plans depends on his labor contribution, conscientiousness, and responsibility. Here an atmosphere has been created in which people are well aware who is working how and are confident that conscientious labor and proper conduct will meet with universal recognition and that absentees and idlers will be shown no indulgence or leniency.

However, in many collectives labor discipline is still in a seriously weak state. The reasons include underestimation of ideological-educational work and shortcomings in selecting and educating cadres.

On the merging of ideological work with political, organizational, and economic work produces the necessary effect. The party committees must make broader use of the educational power of socialist competition and the movement for a communist attitude toward labor, note valuable initiatives promptly, and support and disseminate them.

Is this always successfully achieved? The plenum participants asked. No, not always. There are many cases where exemplary work methods are not properly disseminated. Here is just one example: The Uzbekselmash Plant, as a result of reducing expenditure norms, saves several hundreds of metric tons of metal every year. However, this experience is poorly publicized. And it is no accident that a number of enterprises are only poorly fulfilling the targets for saving fuel and energy and other resources.

The entire system of propaganda and agitation should actively form a new type of economic thinking aimed at initiative and socialist enterprise, at the enhancement of responsibility for the matter in hand, and at a thrifty attitude toward the people's property.

Party and economic study plays a great role in resolving these tasks. Valuable experience has been accumulated in Tashkent City and Tashkent Oblast and in Andizhan, Khorezm, Samarkand, and other oblasts. However, in a number of places classes are held to a low standard and in isolation from the tasks facing the labor collectives. Manifestations of formalism and dogmatism in training are still frequent.

Criticism leveled at socialist sciences workers at the CPSU Central Committee plenum has a direct bearing on Uzbekistan's scientists. Many studies are carried out to a low ideological and theoretical standard and do not suggest new solutions of important problems to practice. Not all scientific workers yet possess the necessary theoretical training. A number of party organizations are failing to pay proper attention to educational work with scientific cadres.

In recent years a number of talented books, plays, and movies of high ideological content have appeared in the republic promoting the formation of the Soviet person's class-based civic stances. Reinforcing and augmenting these successes is a task for today and tomorrow. From the plenum rostrum instances were cited of inaccuracy in placing due ideological stress and of deviation into trivial subject matter and into naturalistic chronicling.

The plenum noted in particular that tireless concern must be displayed for the young people's ideological, labor, and moral tempering, and their education in a spirit of love for the motherland and readiness to come to the defense of the fatherland at any moment. This is the common concern of the family, school, labor collective, and party, soviet, and Komsomol organs. Yet there are still serious problems in training and educational work.

The role of vocational and technical colleges in the great business of the youth's education is growing increasingly. It is here that the cadres of the most progressive, leading class are forged. Noting the successes achieved in developing vocational and technical education, the speakers pointed at the same time to grave shortcomings.

Questions of the further development of the CPSU's nationalities policy occupied a special place in the speeches. It was noted that under the conditions of Soviet Uzbekistan, where representatives of over 120 nations and ethnic groups live and work, it is very important to consider the features of their national traditions, mentality, and culture. A sense of pride in socialist society and indestructible fraternal friendship of the peoples of the USSR must be formed in people more persistently and we must seek to ensure that every person puts all-union interests above all else.

The plenum expressed the firm conviction that the party organizations, ideological cadres, and all Communists of the republic will give their efforts, energy, and talent to the noble cause of the working people's communist education and will continue and creatively enrich the glorious traditions of Bolshevik propaganda.

Additional Information

GF181i40 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 5 Jul 83 p 1

[Text] The 11th Plenum of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee was held on 4 July 1983. Comrade Sh.R. Rashidov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee, presented a report.

The report dealt with the tasks of the republic's party organizations for fulfilling the decisions of the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the instructions and conclusions contained in the speech of Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the plenum.

Reports were presented in the following order by M.M. Musakhanov, first secretary of the Tashkent party Obkom; K.K. Famalov, first secretary of the Karakalpak party committee; U.U. Umarov, first secretary of the Tashkent Gorkom; N.M. Makhmudova, chairman of the Uzbek Trade Unions Council; V.P. Esin, first secretary of the Novoy party Obkom, S.M. Mamarasulov, first secretary of the Andizhan party Obkom; Kh. Rustamova, leader of the cotton brigade of the Ulyanov Sovkhoz in Pakhtakorsk Rayon in Dzhizak Oblast; S.A. Azimov, first secretary of the Uzbekistan Writers Union; R.S. Ashuraliyev, first secretary of the Samarkand party Obkom; N.I. Ermoloyev, a master at the Fergana Textile Combine; A.K. Karimov, first secretary of the Syr Daryo party Obkom; N.A. Moyseef, member of the military council and commander of the Political Department of the Turkmen Military Okrug; E.U. Usupov, vice president of the Turkmen SSR Academy of Sciences; V.N. Sivets, general director of the Tashkent Aviation Production Union imeni V.P. Chkalov; B.A. Allamuradov, first secretary of the Uzbekistan Komsomol Central Committee; and S.Ch. Cherebayev, chairman of the Karshinstroy Territorial Administration.

The plenum heard a report by Comrade E.A. Aytmuratov, secretary of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee, on the progress of fulfilling the resolutions of the Ninth Plenum of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee on measures for further developing livestock production in the republic through 1983-85 in light of the decisions of the May and November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenums. Sh.R. Rashidov addressed the plenum with a closing speech.

The plenum adopted corresponding resolutions on the questions discussed. The Central Committee plenum expelled N. Khimatov and B. Elbayev from the staff of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee for committing errors and for violating the party and government discipline. With this, the plenum of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee concluded its work.

Supreme Soviet Proceedings

GF261626 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 7 Jul 83 p 1

[Excerpts] After hearing and discussing the report of Comrade Mikhaylov, first deputy chairman of the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers, on measures for further improving capital construction in the republic and for putting into action the housing, production, social, and cultural projects, the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet noted that the republic's workers, under the leadership of the party organizations, are working with great enthusiasm for fulfilling the 1983 tasks and the 5-year plan in general. The republic's workers, like all the Soviet peoples, completely adopt the decisions of the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the Eighth Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the election of Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, as chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. They warmly and unanimously support the internal and foreign policy of the CPSU and the course of the party for enhancing the prosperity of the people, and for maintaining peace on earth.

The Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet resolves the following:

1. To consider fulfillment of the tasks of the 11th 5-Year Plan period concerning the exploitation of production capacities, houses, schools and preschools, and medical institutions as the most important task of the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers, the republic's ministries, departments and state committees, the Karakalpak Council of Ministers, the local people's deputies councils, and the construction and assembly and project organizations.
2. To oblige the Ministries of Construction, Agricultural Construction, Construction Materials Industry, Land Reclamation and Water Resources, and Construction and Utilization of Roads; the State Committee for Water Construction; the Main Administration for Construction in Tashkent city; the Main Administration of Sovkhoz Construction; and the Uzbek kolkhoz construction administration to develop and achieve additional measures for the absolute exploitation of production capacities and the projects of social and cultural significance according to the schedule.
3. The Council of Ministers of the Karakalpak Autonomous Republic, the oblast soviet executive committees, and the Tashkent city people's deputies councils have to take the necessary measures for accurately accelerating the rate of work on the construction of the projects of the local councils and for absolutely fulfilling plans for their exploitation. At the same time, they should develop the housing construction cooperatives and expand industrial housing construction, especially in the agricultural fields.
4. The Uzbek SSR State Planning Committee, the republic's state committees and departments, the Karakalpak Council of Ministers, and the executive committees of the local people's deputies council have to maintain concentration of capital investments, material, and human resources in construction works.
5. To instruct the Uzbek SSR State Planning Committee and the republic's offices of the USSR State Bank and Construction Bank to strengthen control over the correct planning of capital investments and contract works and to firmly supervise discipline in this regard.
6. To instruct the Uzbek SSR Ministries of Light Industry, Food Industry, and Meat and Dairy Industry; the contract ministries and department; the Council of Ministers of the Karakalpak Autonomous Republic; and the executive committees of the local councils to step up work for putting into operation and introducing the capacities of the enterprises which produce consumer goods.
7. The Uzbek SSR State Construction Committee is required to strengthen control over the work of the project organizations and absolutely improve the quality of the projects carried out by them. They are also required to improve the architectural designs of the industrial and civil buildings and construction projects.
8. The people's deputies councils and their executive and administrative organs and the permanent commissions should fully use their power in coordinating the activity of the enterprises, institutions and organizations involved in construction questions.

The Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet expresses its firm belief that the ministries, the republic's state committees and departments, the Council of Ministers of the Karakalpak Autonomous Republic, and the executive committees of the local deputies councils, under the leadership of the party organizations will take all the necessary measures for mobilizing the labor collectives for the absolute fulfillment of the state plans and socialist pledges during 1983 and the 11th 5-Year Plan in general and that they will adequately contribute to verifying the majestic plans of the 26th CPSU Congress and the 20th Congress of the Uzbekistan Communist Party.

VOROTNIKOV VISITS VOLGOGRAD 25-27 JUL

Activities Reported

PM281117 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jul 83 First Edition p 2

{TASS report: "Stay in Volgograd Oblast"}

[Text] Volgograd, 27 Jul -- V.I. Vorotnikov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, was in Volgograd Oblast 25-27 July. He visited the Krasnyy Oktyabr Metallurgical Plant, the "Barrikada" Production Association, and the Volga GES named for the 22d CPSU Congress. He inquired about the work of trade enterprises, visited the lower Volga Scientific Research Institute of Agriculture and the sovkhos named for the 60th Anniversary of the USSR and met with voters.

At the CPSU obkom he conversed with the party and soviet aktiv, attention being focused on the oblast party organization's tasks in fulfilling the decisions of the November (1982) and June (1983) Plenums of the CPSU Central Committee, the program provisions contained in the speeches by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, and on the implementation of the plans and socialist pledges of the current year, the 11th 5-Year Plan, and the Food Program. Emphasis was placed on the need to enhance everyone's responsibility for the fulfillment of the tasks set by the party.

The chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers laid a wreath at the Eternal Flame in Fallen Soldier Square and viewed the "Rout of the German Fascist Forces at Stalingrad" cyclorama and the memorial on Soldier's Field. He was accompanied by L.S. Kulichenko, first secretary of Volgograd Obkom, and Yu.I. Lomakin, chairman of the oblispolkom.

Addresses Voters' Meeting

PM280834 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jul 83 Morning Edition p 2

{TASS report: "Following Leninist Course of Creation: Voters' Meeting With V.I. Vorotnikov"}

[Text] Stepping up their creative activeness, the country's labor collectives have launched a socialist competition for the successful fulfillment of targets for the third year of the 5-year plan. Working people in Krasnooktyabrskiy Electoral Okrug in the city of Volgograd are also responding with deeds to the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum. Elections to Russia's highest organ of state power are scheduled here, to replace a deputy who has left.

A meeting of voters with Vitaliy Ivanovich Vorotnikov, candidate deputy to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, was held on 26 July in the Lenin Palace of Culture.

The participants in the meeting unanimously elected a presidium of honor consisting of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

Hero of Socialist Labor A.F. Serkov, production training instructor of the Krasnyy Oktyabr Metallurgical Plant, the candidate's agent, familiarized those present with V.I. Vorotnikov's biography.

The Volgograd people's achievements in the course of fulfilling the 5-year plan targets and their unanimous approval of the tireless activity of the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government to strengthen international security and avert the threat of war were spoken of by B. B. Mylnikov, first secretary of Krasnooktyabrskiy CPSU Raykom; V.A. Pristanskov, electrician at the Barrikady Production Association; Ye. G. Belyayeva, secretary of the Komsomol organization at the Kompleks Production Association; and Yu. V. Lepekhin, honored schoolteacher of the RSFSR.

The speakers called on the okrug's voters to give their votes to the candidate of the indestructible bloc of Communists and nonparty people on polling day.

A speech was delivered by Vitaliy Ivanovich Vorotnikov, who was greeted warmly by the voters. He expressed cordial gratitude to all the collectives which nominated him as a candidate deputy of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

I regard the trust displayed toward me, the speaker said, as an expression of the Volgograd people's devotion to the CPSU and approval for the multifaceted work done by its Central Committee in implementing the impressive plans for building a new society.

The preparations for the elections to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet for Krasnooktyabrskiy Election Okrug are taking place in the atmosphere of the Soviet people's widely developed struggle to fulfill the decisions of the 26th party congress and the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) and June (1983) Plenums. The June Plenum decisions and Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's speech at the plenum outline the main directions for improving developed socialism, increasing the working people's communist awareness, and improving ideological and political education work. Communists and all working people in the RSFSR, warmly approving the plenum decisions, are now defining their place in their successful implementation.

In the economic sphere, radically improving labor productivity is the key task. V. I. Lenin stressed that in the last analysis this is the most important, chief thing to ensure the victory of the new social system. The republic's working people, implementing Lenin's behest, have achieved a further growth in labor productivity. The main growth in production both in industry and in other sectors of the national economy is achieved on the basis of this indicator. But in general the level of labor productivity cannot yet satisfy us: Where two or even three people work today, one worker could and should cope with the task. That is how the party formulates the matter. But to this end it is necessary to devote more attention to the retooling of production and to improving the organization and remuneration of labor, production, and management.

This is not only an economic problem, but an important social problem too.

The use of the sophisticated technology of today and tomorrow is the basis for the transition to intensive development and for combining in practice the advantages of socialism and the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution.

Of course, direct, active participation in this work must be exercised by Volgograd's enterprises and organizations, which produce many types of modern machinery, materials, and equipment. They must meet the highest demands of the domestic and world market.

Particular importance is attached to production intensification on the basis of modern machinery in agriculture. In this connection V.I. Vorotnikov stressed the need for strict, rigorous fulfillment of agriculture's orders by industrial enterprises, construction organizations, and other organizations in the city. The implementation of the Food Program and the satisfaction of the working people's requirements for food products largely depend on this.

The situation in agriculture is uneven this year. In the republic as a whole the harvest is expected to be rather higher than last year. But in the Northern Caucasus and the Lower Volga, including Volgograd Oblast, hot dry weather persisted for a long time, which has naturally affected the yield of grain and other crops. Difficult conditions are also taking shape in certain other regions. In this connection it is particularly important to prevent losses, to gather in everything that has been grown in the fields, and to fully preserve the crop.

Much work lies ahead for workers in other sectors of the national economy too. It is the construction workers' duty to commission all the projects which the plan envisages for this year, to combat the dispersal of resources over numerous construction projects, and to improve the quality of housing and civil construction.

The speaker dwelt in detail on questions of strengthening discipline and order and enhancing organization and responsibility in all components of the national economy. Educate people in the day-to-day struggle to fulfill state plans; improve product quality; utilize production capacities, raw materials, power, and working time efficiently; and strengthen organization and discipline; actively combat sluggishness, bureaucracy, and departmental and local narrowmindedness -- that is how the party's Central Committee keenly formulates the question, in Leninist fashion. The best way to do this work is to educate people through positive example, through models of leading experience.

Discipline must be formed and maintained by the whole tenor of working life -- its rational organization, the smooth rhythm of work, and the strict application of the principle of remuneration according to labor. Here it is important to apply the whole system of economic, educational, and administrative measures.

Great significance for increasing production efficiency is attached to the struggle for savings and thrift and the better use of raw materials, power, and financial resources. This is a major economic reserve. The moral aspect of this cause is equally important. In our society everything created by labor has not only material value, but also moral value.

In accordance with the decisions of the 26th party congress and subsequent Central Committee plenums, work is underway in the republic to save materials, fuel, electricity, and thermal power. At the same time potential for the more rational utilization of material and technical resources is still not adequately exploited.

The ultimate aim of our efforts in the economic sphere is to improve people's living conditions and enhance their well-being, V.I. Vorotnikov went on. Here I have in mind not only increasing the population's income and consumer goods production. The concept of "living standard" is far wider and richer. It includes the constant upsurge of people's consciousness and standards in relation to daily life, conduct, and sensible consumption. It includes exemplary public order, health, and sensible nutrition, and high quality services to the population. And it includes using free time to the full from the moral and aesthetic viewpoint. The resolution of all these major tasks will mean a considerable advance toward the social homogeneity of society. This great aim is a question of direct practice for us.

Developed socialism ensures all the necessary conditions for increasing the people's well-being. Approximately four-fifths of the total volume of national income is channeled directly toward these purposes. Much is being done to step up consumer goods production. In the first 6 months of this year alone the republic has produced cultural, consumer, and household goods to the tune of nearly R15 billion. The working people's diet is improving.

At the same time the population's demand for certain food products, particularly livestock products, is not fully satisfied. The potential of the population's personal plots is not used to the full everywhere in the interest of increasing the output of produce. But of course, the most important thing is to develop the public sector in agriculture and fulfill the targets outlined in the Food Program for increasing the production and sale to the state of arable and livestock products on the basis of efficient utilization of land, machinery, fertilizers, and other material resources and the dynamic development of all sectors of the agroindustrial complex.

Great significance for enhancing the working people's well-being is attached to the constant improvement of housing and municipal conditions. In the first 2 years of this 5-year plan alone, 120.5 million square meters of housing have been commissioned in the republic. In the not too distant future every family will have an individual apartment. Here it is important to constantly improve the quality and planning of apartment blocks and the provision of amenities in them, both in the city and in the countryside.

Our society's achievements in making spiritual wealth available to the masses and improving the working people's cultural level are great. We cannot help being proud that in recent decades the RSFSR, like the country as a whole, has scaled qualitatively new heights in the development of culture, that people's intellectual needs have increased sharply, and that art has become a most important element in the people's leisure.

Speaking of achievements in cultural life, we do not lose sight of the shortcomings and unresolved problems which exist. Cultural organs are called upon to improve the standard of leadership of cultural enlightenment institutions and expand cooperation with other departments and public organizations.

The goals facing us in the sphere of cultural building should be seen in close unity with the task set by the party of bringing all ideological, educational, and propaganda work up to the level of the large-scale, complex tasks which our society is resolving in the process of improving developed socialism.

Our society is developing under the sign of the further improvement of Soviet statehood and the expansion of socialist democracy, which in practice guarantees all citizens equality before the law, real political freedoms, and socioeconomic rights. Much has been done recently in this direction. Suffice it to mention the law on labor collectives adopted at the USSR Supreme Soviet session, which provides for the further extension of their powers in the production sphere and in improving working and living conditions. The party, displaying concern for constantly extending the working people's participation in the management of production and of all society's affairs, emphasizes the need for active utilization of all forms of socialist democracy.

Soviets of People's Deputies and their organs are called upon to use to the full their very broad rights. The activity of deputies, standing commissions, and executive committees in national economic leadership is improving steadily and taking on board everything rational and valuable that is engendered by day-to-day practice.

The party indicates the need to increase publicity in the work of soviet and economic organs and their accountability to the working people, stressing that control by the masses is a most important means of educating cadres and is our society's great strength. An attentive attitude toward working people's proposals and needs and flexible, business-like examination of them is an essential rule in the work of Soviet and economic organs.

Among the factors which influence the course of our country's development and the resolution of urgent problems in communist building, an important place belongs to the processes taking place in the world arena, the speaker went on to note. The present international situation is exceptionally tense and complex. A sharp exacerbation of the struggle between the two social systems, without precedent in the entire postwar period, is taking place. The arms race unleashed by the United States is taking on an unprecedented scale and military spending is increasing without restraint. The Washington administration has launched a "crusade" against socialism, and seeks to undermine the socialist countries' economic and political positions and entertains designs on gaining world domination.

But these plans are not fated to succeed. The Soviet people and their allies firmly rebuff imperialist circles' attempts to reverse the course of events in the world arena, halt the peoples' advance toward freedom and progress, and change the established correlation of forces in their own favor.

The Soviet leadership's statement to the effect that the Soviet Union, proceeding on the basis of the interests of peace and its own security, will in no event permit anyone to achieve military superiority over it, was a stern warning to imperialist forces. The actions of our party and the Soviet Government aimed at strengthening peace and the country's security enjoy the full support of all the Soviet people.

The broad package of peace initiatives put forward by the USSR and the fraternal socialist countries has met with a great response throughout the world and has a tremendous influence on stepping up the peoples' struggle against the arms race and the threat of war. The implementation of the concrete measures proposed by the Soviet Union offers a practical opportunity to halt the dangerous turn of events and return them to a healthy course.

Soviet people feel pride in the tremendous contribution which the Communist Party and the Soviet state make to ensuring peace. They are well aware that the firmness of our country's foreign policy positions, its ability to resolutely withstand imperialism's pressure, and its ability to serve as a reliable bulwark for the peoples in the struggle for peace and progress are based on selfless labor and on the steadily growing economic might and defense capability of the Soviet state.

All our society's impressive gains and its successes in economic, social, and cultural development are associated with the activity of Lenin's party. Created at the Second Russian Social Democratic Workers Party Congress, whose 80th anniversary our country is currently marking, it has dedicated itself to the selfless service of the working people's interests, the cause of the revolutionary transformation of society, and the triumph of the great ideas of communism, freedom, and fraternity between peoples. V.I. Vorotnikov said in conclusion. He gave an assurance that he will do everything to justify the high trust of the voters who nominated him as a candidate deputy to the RSFSR's highest organ of state power.

VOROTNIKOV CONGRATULATES EXPEDITION MEMBERS

PM250922 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Jul 83 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report under general heading: "Meeting at RSFSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] On 19 July a meeting with members of the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA polar expedition was held at the RSFSR Council of Ministers. V.I. Vorotnikov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, congratulated Sergej Solovyev and his comrades on successfully completing a unique walking tour of the entire Soviet Arctic region.

III. 1 Aug 83

R 17

USSR NATIONAL AFFAIRS
POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Heroism was a daily matter in your expedition's work, V.I. Vorotnikov stressed. The participants in the tour group described how the idea for the actual journey had arisen, how it was prepared, and its scientific and practical results. Special interest was generated by S. Solovyev's description of the national economic problems of the north and the lives and concerns of the hunters, trappers, fishermen, and other workers of the multinational Soviet Arctic.

Comrade V.I. Vorotnikov wished all the participants of the northern walking tour recuperation of strength and health, the speediest processing of the valuable materials collected, and successes in implementing further plans, in particular preparation for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA's Far Eastern tour.

STUKALIN ADDRESSES STAVROPOL PARTY PLENUM

LD191425 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 19 Jul 83

[Text] The results of the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the tasks originating from its solutions and the speech of Comrade Andropov were discussed today at a plenum of the Stavropol Kraykom. The entire country knows of the successes of the grain farmers of Ipatovskiy Rayon. On the recommendation of scientists, they were the first to introduce the high-productivity, integrated method of using the machinery-tractor pull 7 years ago. The participants in the plenum highly appraised the practice of conducting ideological plan review meetings [planerka] at enterprises and organizations and the setting up of public, ideological commissions in primary party organizations.

However, the style of work of certain party committees, which substitute vital, organizational work with unnecessary paperwork and innumerable conferences, was subjected to round condemnation at the plenum.

Stukalin, chief of the Propaganda Department of the CPSU Central Committee, spoke at the plenum.

PARTY-STATE AGROINDUSTRIAL RESOLUTION ADOPTED

PM290814 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jul 83 First Edition pp 1-2

[Unattributed Report: "At the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers, in accordance with the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee May (1982) Plenum, have adopted a resolution "On Improving the Economic Relationships Between Agriculture and Other Sectors of the National Economy."

The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers have obliged the Union Republic Communist Party Central Committees and Councils of Ministers, local soviet ispolkoms, the USSR Ministry of Agriculture, the USSR Ministry of Fruit and Vegetable Farming, the USSR Ministry of the Food Industry, the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources, the USSR Ministry of Procurements, the USSR State Committee for the Supply of Production Equipment for Agriculture [Goskomselkhoztekhnika], and the republican (ASSR), kray, oblast, and rayon agroindustrial associations to take steps to further improve economic relationships between agriculture and other sectors of the agro-industrial complex with a view to ensuring:

The enhanced responsibility of enterprises and organizations servicing the kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agricultural enterprises and organizations for increasing production and procurements of agricultural products, and for the quality of work and services and the time taken to perform and render these;

The enhanced interest of the enterprises and organizations servicing kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agricultural enterprises and organizations and also of procurement enterprises and organizations in achieving good end results in the growth of the economic effectiveness of agricultural production output.

It has been stipulated that the USSR State Committee for Prices, by agreement with the USSR Gosplan, the USSR Ministry of Finance, the USSR Ministry of Agriculture, the USSR Ministry of Fruit and Vegetable Farming, and the Union Republic Councils of Ministers, proceeding from the change in the correlation of existing purchase prices for agricultural output and the wholesale prices for the industrial output sold to agriculture (determined after taking into consideration the national economic effectiveness of the industrial output supplies to agriculture) and also in the rates and tariffs for services rendered to kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agricultural enterprises and organizations, will submit to the USSR Council of Ministers, at the same time that it provides the draft plan for the economic and social development of the USSR for the next 5-year plan period, proposals for purchase prices for agricultural output and supplements to these prices.

In determining the level of purchase prices for agricultural produce for the next 5-year plan it is necessary to proceed from the need to assure the sectorial norm for aggregate profitability with a consideration for the planned volumes of agricultural produce production and purchases, the farms' provision with funds, the level of labor remuneration, and other planned expenses on the production of agricultural output, providing for an increase in agricultural production efficiency, an improvement in the use of fixed and working capital, and a reduction in material expenditure.

The USSR State Committee for Prices by agreement with the USSR Gosplan, the USSR Ministry of Finance and the USSR Ministry of Agriculture, has been instructed to submit to the USSR Council of Ministers 3 months before the deadline set for the draft plan for the economic and social development of the USSR for the next 5-year plan period, proposals for the standard for the aggregate profitability of agricultural production.

It is envisaged that as of 1983 the main indicators in assessing the activity of enterprises and organizations servicing kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agriculture enterprises and organizations and of procurement enterprises and organizations are: for rayon (interrayon) production associations and branches of Selkhoztekhnika -- the growth of agricultural production output and the raising of labor productivity on the farms serviced by comparison with the level reached over the previous 5 years, the fulfillment of contract commitments for all types of production and technical backup for kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agricultural enterprises and organizations, the quality of the work performed and services rendered, and the reduction of expenditure on their implementation;

For rayon (interrayon) production associations of the agrochemical services to agriculture [Selkhozkhimiya] system and enterprises and organizations of the Soyuzselkhozkhimiya association -- an increase in the production of plant growing output on the farms serviced by comparison with the level reached in the previous 5 years, the return on the mineral fertilizers, plant protection agents, and other chemicals, the fulfillment of long-term commitments for agrochemical services for kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agricultural enterprises and organizations, the quality of the work performed, and the reduction of expenditure on their implementation;

For water resources repair and operation organizations and poliv rayon production associations -- the growth of the production of plant growing output on the farms serviced on reclaimed land by comparison with the level reached over the previous 5 years by means of an increase in the yield of agricultural crops, the attainment of the planned yield for agricultural crops on newly developed land, the fulfillment of long-term commitments for servicing kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agricultural enterprises and organizations, and the rational use of water and material resources;

For procurement enterprises and organizations -- the fulfillment of the state plan for purchases of agricultural products and raw material, the growth of volumes of purchases by comparison with the level reached over the previous 5 years, the ensuring of the safekeeping of the output procured, the timely processing and delivery of a broad range of high-quality output to consumers and the reduction of expenditure on procuring, storing, and processing output.

It is planned to set norms for forming the material incentive fund and the fund for sociocultural measures and housing construction at the enterprises and organizations servicing kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agricultural enterprises and organizations in relation to the fulfillment of these indicators.

It is envisaged that when the rayon (interrayon) production associations and departments of the Selkhoztekhnika and Selkhozkhimiya perform work on comprehensive technical servicing of the machinery and tractor pool of kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agricultural enterprises and organizations and on the comprehensive agrochemical cultivation of land, accounts between the farms and these associations and departments are settled within the annual limits set by the rayon agroindustrial organizations proceeding from planned normative expenditure (taking account of normative accumulations) which should not be in excess of these farms' actual average proportional expenditure on this work over the preceding 3 years.

If the current cost of work and services for the repair and technical servicing of tractors, trucks, agricultural machinery, and equipment and on the comprehensive agrochemical cultivation of land proves higher than the set annual limit, the excess sum is put down to the results of the economic activity of the rayon (interrayon) production associations and departments of Selkhoztekhnika and Selkhozkhimiya.

It has been established that when the rayon (interrayon) production associations and departments of the Selkhoztekhnika and Selkhozkhimiya, the water resources repair and operation organizations, and rayon poliv production associations perform work which is a component part of the manufacturing processes for the production of agricultural output (respectively, mechanized operations, full production services for farms, comprehensive technical servicing of the machinery and tractor pool and equipment of stockraising units and complexes, the application of organic and mineral fertilizers to the fields and their digging in to the soil, the treatment of crops and pesticides, the repair and technical servicing of internal farm irrigation and drainage network, and the watering of agricultural crops), accounts with them are settled on an annual basis, proceeding from a figure of 92 percent of the cost of the work actually performed and services rendered in accordance with prices, tariffs and rates set in accordance with established procedure.

According to the results of work for the year, additional payments will be made at the rate of 1 percent of the cost of the work actually performed and services actually rendered for each percentage of fulfillment (above 92 percent) and overfulfillment of the set plans for the production of all agricultural output as a whole or individual types on the kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agricultural enterprises and organizations serviced, or their production subdivisions;

for production associations and departments of the Selkhoztekhnika this will be for agricultural output as a whole or individual types of agricultural output;

for the Selkhozkhimiya production associations it will be plant growing output as a whole or individual types of this output;

for the water resources repair and operation organizations and poliv rayon production associations it will be for plant growing output on reclaimed land.

The USSR Gosbank has been instructed to provide the rayon (interrayon) production associations and department of the Selkhoztekhnika and Selkhozkhimiya, the water resources repair and operation organizations, and poliv rayon production associations with short-term loans for planned expenditure in connection with introducing the new accounting procedure for work performed, these loans being repaid on the basis of the results of work for the year. An annual interest rate of 1 percent has been set for using these loans.

It is envisaged that as of 1983 the leading engineering and technical workers and specialists who are responsible for fulfilling the plan for state purchase of agricultural output and who work at state procurement enterprises and organizations and also at enterprises and organizations which make purchases of agricultural output under contract alongside their main activity will have a larger bonus from the material incentives funds for the basic results of their economic activity in fulfilling the purchases plan. The sum by which the bonus for one worker is increased should be higher than 2 months' salary so that the total sum of bonuses paid to one worker in a year should not be in excess of the maximum set amount.

The award of bonuses for fulfilling the plan for state purchases of agricultural produce may be made on the basis of work for the year while bonuses for fulfilling the plan for purchases of tobacco, bast crops, leaf tea, and medicinal crops may be awarded on the basis of seasonal work.

When one enterprises or organization makes procurements of several types of agricultural output, it is envisaged that the fulfillment of the purchases plan be determined in cost terms on the basis of current prices while the plan must be fulfilled for purchases of the most important types of agricultural output in physical terms according to the list drawn up by the relevant USSR ministry and department.

With regard to workers of the rayon (interrayon) production associations and department of the Selkhoztekhnika and Selkhozkhimiya the water resources repair and operation organizations, and rayon poliv production associations who have taken part in performing work which is a component of manufacturing processes for the production of agricultural output, sovkhozes and other state agricultural enterprises and organizations are authorized and kolkhozes are recommended to sell to these workers grain, potatoes, vegetables, fruit, berries, grapes, melons, and feed crops in accordance with the procedure laid down by workers (kolkhoz members) of the farms serviced within the limits of the overall scales of payment in kind for work in agriculture stipulated by existing legislation.

It has been laid down that the rayon (interrayon) production associations and departments of the Selkhoztekhnika and Selkhozkhimiya, the water resources repair and operation organizations and rayon poliv production associations should return to kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agricultural enterprises and organizations 50 percent of the above-plan profit from activity in servicing them in proportion to the volumes of work performed in cost terms, while the remaining 50 percent remains at the disposal of these associations, enterprises, and organizations, and is distributed in accordance with established procedures.

When the agroindustrial associations, in accordance with the rights granted to them, approve the rates (tariffs) for the services rendered to the kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agricultural enterprises and organizations and the work performed for them by the servicing enterprises and organizations, a profitability normative is planned at the rate of 8 percent of the prime cost of these operations and services.

The USSR State Committee for Prices, by agreement with the USSR Gosplan and USSR Ministry of Finance, has been instructed to submit 18 months before the before the next 5-year plan to the USSR Council of Ministers, in accordance with a submission [po predstavleniyu] from the USSR Ministry of Agriculture, from the USSR Goskomselkhoztekhnika, and from the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources, proposals for making this normative more precise.

The total sum of profit of the production associations and departments of the Selkhoztekhnika and Selkhozkhimiya and water resources repair and operation organizations and rayon poliv production associations is coordinated with the relevant agroindustrial associations and is approved by the organization ranking above it.

The profit, coordinated and approved in accordance with the above procedure, is counted in drafting the state plan for the economic and social development of the USSR and the USSR state budget.

The elimination of the shortcomings revealed during the guarantee period in tractors, trucks, agricultural machinery, and equipment sold to kolkhozes, sovkhoses, and other agricultural enterprises and organizations must be undertaken by the rayon (interrayon) production associations and departments of the Selkhoztekhnika.

The elimination of uncompleted work revealed during the guarantee period in the water resources and land reclamation network is undertaken by the water resources organizations at their own expense.

The Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building, the Ministry of Machine Building for Animal Husbandry and Feed production, and other USSR ministries and departments supplying tractors, trucks, agricultural machinery, and equipment for agriculture have been asked to ensure the production and delivery of spare parts to create in 1984-1985 in the rayon (interrayon) production Selkhoztekhnika associations and departments a reserve stock of units, assemblies, and components to repair tractors, trucks, agricultural machinery and equipment which go out of commission within the guarantee period.

It has been laid down that within a month of receiving a report, drafted in accordance with the set procedure, on the quality of the tractors, trucks, and agricultural machinery and equipment which have gone out of commission within the guarantee period through the fault of the enterprises which have manufactured them, the enterprises producing tractors, trucks, and agricultural machinery and equipment must dispatch to the rayon (interrayon) production association or Selkhoztekhnika department units, assemblies and components to make up the reserve stock, replacing those which have gone out of commission.

When the manufacturing enterprise is to blame for the fact that tractors, trucks, and agricultural machinery and equipment have gone out of commission within the guarantee period, the expense in repairing them, including the cost of spare parts and other materials, transport and general overheads, are reimbursed to the rayon (interrayon) production associations and Selkhoztekhnika departments by the manufacturing enterprises. In addition the manufacturing enterprises compensate the rayon (interrayon) production associations and Selkhoztekhnika departments for the losses incurred, including fines, penalties, and other sums paid to farms in connection with the sale of poor quality output and also with the stoppage of tractors, trucks, agricultural machinery and equipment over and above the set schedules when the manufacturing enterprises violate their pledges for the dispatch of spare parts to the reserve stock for repair under guarantee.

When new or repaired tractors, trucks, agricultural machinery, and equipment go out of commission through the fault of the manufacturing enterprise (specialized repair enterprise) within the guarantee period, the kolkhozes, sovkhoses, and other agricultural enterprises and organizations have the right, on the basis of the relevant quality export, within 10 days of the tractors, trucks, agricultural machinery and equipment being repaired, to submit to a bank a demand for payment based on the rayon (interrayon) production association or Selkhoztekhnika association of the cost of repair at the set rates, the sum of the fine for delivering poor-quality output and, in the relevant cases, of the penalty for failing to eliminate defects within the set period while the association or Selkhoztekhnika department in accordance with the same procedure can demand that the above-mentioned sums be deducted from the account of the manufacturing enterprise (specialized repair enterprise).

As of 15 July 1983 a procedure is being introduced whereby for defaulting on the deadline or failing to deliver mineral fertilizers, plant protection agents, and other chemical output (through the fault of the manufacturing enterprises) supplies pay the rayon (interrayon) Selkhozkhimiya production associations and enterprises and organizations belonging to the Soyuzselkhozkhimiya association system a penalty of 12 percent of the cost of the output which has not been delivered on time for individual items in the products list (range).

Instructions have been issued to the following to draft and, in agreement with the USSR Ministry of Finance, USSR Ministry of Justice, USSR Supreme Court, and USSR Council of Ministers State Arbitration Board, to institute within 3 months:

To the USSR Goskomselkhoztekhnika and the USSR Ministry of Agriculture -- a provision on the procedure for concluding and executing contracts for the fulfillment of work for production and technical services for kolkhozes, sovkhoses, and other agricultural enterprises and organizations by the rayon (interrayon) production associations and Selkhoztekhnika departments and standard contracts for performing this work;

To the USSR Ministry of Agriculture -- a provision on the procedure for concluding and executing contracts for agrochemical services for kolkhozes, sovkhoses, and other agricultural enterprises and organizations by the rayon (interrayon) production associations for agrochemical services to agriculture and by enterprises and organizations of the Soyuzselkhozkhimiya association system and a standard contract for agrochemical services to these farms;

the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources and the USSR Ministry of Agriculture -- standard contracts for the repair and technical servicing of internal farm land reclamation networks, the irrigation of agricultural crops, and other work performed for the kolkhozes, sovkhoses, and other farms by the enterprises and organizations belonging to the system of the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources.

The USSR Ministry of Procurements and the USSR Ministry of Agriculture have been asked to draft, with the participation of the USSR Ministry of Fruit and Vegetable Farming, the USSR Ministry of the Food Industry, the USSR Ministry of the Meat and Dairy Industry, the USSR Ministry of Light Industry, and the Tsentosoyuz; and to institute within 3 months by agreement with the USSR Ministry of Finances, the USSR Ministry of Justice, the USSR Supreme Court, and the USSR Council of Ministers State Arbitration Board, regulations governing the procedure for concluding and executing contracts for the supply of agricultural produce and standard contracts for supplying this produce.

These regulations and the supply contracts must provide for measures aimed at enhancing the procurement organizations' responsibility for receiving all agricultural produce supplied by the farms and for storing it and enhancing the responsibility of the kolkhozes and sovkhoses for the quality of the produce sold to the state.

In cases where incorrect accounting occurs between the procurement and servicing enterprises and organizations and the kolkhozes and sovkhoses for the agricultural output sold and the work performed for them, the rayon agroindustrial associations have been given the right to file a claim against the procurement and servicing enterprises and organizations in favor of the kolkhozes, sovkhoses, and other agricultural enterprises and organizations (unless these claims are filed by these farms) for the sums they have not received or by which they have overpaid.

It has been laid down that when these sums are exacted in favor of the kolkhozes, sovkhoses, and other agricultural enterprises and organizations, the procurement and servicing enterprises and organizations also pay into the union budget revenue a fine equal to 20 percent of the sums exacted.

With a view to enhancing the responsibility of enterprises and organizations belonging to the system of the USSR Goskomselkhoztekhnika, the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources, and the Soyuzselkhozkhimiya association for the quality of the fulfillment of work and rendering of services and the time taken over them, it has been planned to introduce the practice of reports from the leaders of these enterprises and organizations at kolkhoz general meetings (meetings of agents), production conferences of the collectives of workers and specialists at sovkhoses, other state agricultural enterprises and organizations on the fulfillment of contract commitments.

The USSR Gosplan, with the participation of interested USSR ministries and departments, has been instructed to generalize, in 1984-1985, the experience in applying measures to improve economic relationships between agriculture and other sectors of the national economy stipulated by this resolution and where necessary, in conjunction with the USSR Ministry of Finance, the USSR State Committee for Prices, the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, the USSR Ministry of Justice, and the USSR Ministry of Agriculture, to submit to the USSR Council of Ministers relevant proposals for the further improvement of these relationships.

The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers have drawn the attention of the party, soviet, and agricultural organs and agroindustrial association councils to the fact that for the successful implementation of the USSR Food Program -- as well as the implementation of additional steps aimed at improving economic relationships between sectors, enterprises, and organizations of the agroindustrial complex -- it is essential to substantially step up economic work on the kolkhozes, sovkhoses, and enterprises and organizations servicing them; to ensure the introduction of effective internal accounting in teams, departments, shops, stockraising units, and sectors, to introduce the team contract method to raise labor productivity, reduce prime cost, improve quality, and reduce losses of agricultural produce; and to take steps to strengthen planning, manufacturing, financial, and executive discipline.

SELSKAYA ZHIZN REPORTS ON HARVEST PROGRESS

PM291623 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 28 Jul 83 p 1

["Agricultural Review" by N. Osychkin: "Every Hour -- For Harvesting!"]

[Text] Each day the harvesting campaign spreads further and further across the country. It is now in progress in all union republics. According to an USSR Central Statistical Administration report, by 25 July grain and pulse crops (excluding corn) in kolkhozes, sovkhoses, and interfarm enterprises had been cut on an area of 33.4 million hectares. Threshing has been carried out on 27.7 million hectares which is 83 percent of the cut area. The past week has seen a 7.2 million hectare increase in threshed areas, which is somewhat greater than in the previous week. The elevators and reception centers are receiving grain which is being sold in fulfillment of state plans and pledges.

The volume of fieldwork is unusually large in the busy summer period. All these operations are urgent and cannot be delayed. Nonetheless, chief attention must be concentrated everywhere on the questions of the speediest completion of reaping, grain procurement, and the laying in of a sound feed stock.

The better these questions are solved in each kolkhoz and sovkhoz, the more successful will be the fulfillment of the 5-year plan's third year targets.

This is well understood by the farmers of Saratov Oblast's leading farms, who are engaged in full-scale harvesting work. Grain crops here have already been cut on over 1.5 million hectares, and half of them have been threshed. The Lenin, Pobeda, and 40 Let Oktyabrya Kolkhozes are among the leaders in Krasnokutskiy Rayon. People there do not allow large intervals to occur between cutting, threshing, and preliminary processing. High-standard wheat is being delivered without interruption to the Krasnyy Kut elevator. Damp grain is subjected to drying. This is how people in other rayons of the oblast too are operating. A single motor transport control center is making it possible to effect all shipments strictly according to schedule. The experience of Saratov Oblast's best collectives proves the great opportunities available for further speeding up reaping and grain transportation.

In the RSFSR grain and pulse crops have been cut on 17 million hectares, which is 25 percent of the total area sown with them.

Threshing has been carried out on 12.7 million hectares, which is 75 percent of the cut area. Reaping in Northern Caucasus is coming to an end. Grain crops have been cut on over 75 percent of fields in Volgograd, Belgorod, and Voronezh Oblasts. Orel Oblast's machine operators have cut almost 50 percent of crops. Volgo-Vyatka Region's farms have threshed the first few tens of thousands of hectares of eared crops and peas.

The weather is not favorable for harvesting operations everywhere and some of the grain crops have become lodged. This is why it is necessary to make use of every hour of fine weather and ensure that machinery is fully operational and that the drivers of each combine harvester, reaper, and truck increase their output. Special concern must be shown to maintain high quality of work and prevent losses of eared crop grains and peas.

In the Tartar ASSR, for example, reaping is being done by the non-combine method; each unit is equipped with stalk lifters and other appliances making it possible to avoid grain losses. At the same time it must not be ignored that in some oblasts of the Volga Region and the Central Region the grain crops remain for rather long periods in windrows after being cut and at the threshing floors are prepared only slowly for dispatch to the elevators.

The Ukraine's machine operators have gathered the harvest on 11 million hectares and are engaged on the 12th. Stalk-lifters are being used wherever the crops have lodged. Special appliances have been developed for turning over the damp windrows. In Kirovograd Oblast's Ustinovskiy Sovkhoz, combine harvester operator Ya. Gera has already threshed over 10,000 quintals and is now helping the neighboring farm with its wheat threshing. Having completed the reaping, the republic's kolkhozes and sovkhozes are shipping the grain to the elevators.

Harvesting in Kazakhstan is extending further and further to the north. Grain crops there have been cut on the first 2.3 million hectares. The kolkhozes and sovkhozes in Aktyubinsk, Guryev, and Dzhezkazgan Oblasts are now engaged in the mass harvesting and sale of grain. This work will soon be upon the north Kazakhstan farms. Not everything, however, is in order regarding machine readiness here. In Kokchetav Oblast only 79 percent of combine harvesters are in order, 77 percent in Pavlodar Oblast, and 58 percent in Turgay Oblast.

We must note the poor state of readiness of machines for the harvesting of grain and feed crops, corn, and sugar beet in other places, too. Repair work is being hampered basically by a shortage of spare parts. The enterprises of the Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building have failed to deliver to agriculture sufficient quantities of tractor crankshafts and reaper blocks; the Ministry of Machine Building for Animal Husbandry and Fodder Production -- feed transportation trailers, and the Ministry of Automotive Industry -- clutch plates and piston rings for trucks. Insufficient supplies of diesel fuel and gasoline were delivered in July to rural areas. It is important to overcome the lag more rapidly and to effect deliveries strictly according to schedules as was done, for example, by the Krasnoyarsk Production Associations for grain harvesting combines. Following a critical article in SELSKAYA ZHIZN, its enterprises have significantly increased the output and shipment of cutting assembly blades, couplings, and other components.

Together with reaping and grain procurement, it is important to maintain a uniform rhythm for all other operations of summer fieldwork. Mass vegetable harvesting is in progress in the south. According to current data, over 3 million metric tons of vegetables have already been purchased. Some 1.3 million metric tons of early potatoes have been delivered. The shipments of this product to the all-union stocks are being stepped up. It is necessary to gather and transport it everywhere without delay so as to better satisfy the purchasers' demands. More fruit and berries were available for sale than at the same time last year.

The harvesting of fiber flax is spreading. It has been pulled on the first 121,000 hectares, basically in the Ukraine. The RSFSR's flax producing oblasts will soon begin this work. Nevertheless, almost 20 percent of flax harvesting combines and reapers are out of commission here.

The soil on 19 million hectares has been prepared for winter crop sowing. Surface cultivation of the soil following non-fallow previous crops is progressing on a large scale. Field preparation for winter crop sowing must be speeded up, particularly in the Nonchernozem Zone, where it is only a matter of days before the seed drills will be taken out onto the fields.

The farms are laying in seeds and bringing them into the proper condition so that they will germinate evenly. The second sowing of various crops has been performed on 2.4 million hectares. This will make it possible to produce a considerable supplementary amount of feed and grain.

The first hundreds of thousands of acres of fields for winter fallowing have been plowed. This work is becoming increasingly widespread. Early plowing is a guarantee of high yields next year.

ADMIRAL MEDVEDEV NOTES NEED FOR COMBAT READINESS

LD311452 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 31 Jul 83

[Commentary by Admiral Pavel Nikolayevich Medvedev [rank as heard], member of the Military Council and chief of the Political Directorate of the Navy]

[Excerpts] There has been a special increase lately in the significance of a high level of combat readiness on the part of the armed forces. This has been caused first and foremost by an increase in the aggressiveness of imperialism and its military preparations and adventurism.

As was stressed in the speech by Comrade Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov at the June Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, there has been a sharp increase in the aggressiveness of ultrareactionary forces led by U.S. imperialism. The right wing of the monopolist bourgeoisie is gaining the upper hand in the leading capitalist countries. It views military force as a universal means for resolving all matters in dispute. This adventurist policy represents an extreme danger for the whole of mankind.

In these conditions the Communist Party and the Soviet Government show constant concern for raising the defense might of our state and of the whole socialist community. The Soviet Navy is equipped with first-class combat equipment and weaponry and is the embodiment of the very latest achievements of military thinking, of the science and technology of the homeland, the result of the selfless labor of scientists, designers and workers' collectives.

The main force of the fleet is people who are utterly devoted to the ideals of communism, the Leninist party and the Soviet people closely rallied around the Central Committee of CPSU and the Soviet Government.

Communists and Komsomol members are in the vanguard of the patriotic movement under the slogan "Let us master the new technology better." They account for 98 percent of the personnel.

Long-distance seafaring ocean voyages have become a real school for courage, military skill, and moral and political and psychological tempering. That is also the case for naval exercises in which the personnel fulfill their military duty with a sharpened feeling of responsibility and in a strenuous and worthy manner. This was confirmed most convincingly at the exercises of troops and naval forces which took place recently on the territory of the Baltic area and western Belorussia under the leadership of Comrade Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov, USSR Defense Minister and marshal of the Soviet Union. Those who took part in this year's round-the-world antarctic expedition aboard the oceanographic ships "Admiral Vladimirskiy," and "Faddey Bellingaussen" showed excellent nautical training and high moral and political qualities as well as physical hardiness. The personnel of the expedition bore the flag of the homeland with honor during the difficult voyage and carried out an enormous scientific program.

The military sailors of the land of the soviets are deeply aware of their very high degree of responsibility to the Communist Party and the Soviet Government and our people for the reliable defense of the maritime frontiers of the homeland and the achievements of socialism.

FURTHER EVENTS OF MOSCOW NAVY DAY REPORTED

PM291329 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Jul 83 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Guarding the Maritime Borders"]

[Text] A ceremony marking USSR Navy Day was held yesterday in the M.V. Frunze Central Soviet Army Club. Representatives of the Moscow public, servicemen at the Moscow garrison, seamen, defense industry workers, and navy veterans gathered in the Red Banner Hall.

The meeting presidium comprised N.I. Savinkin, chief of a CPSU Central Committee section; M.V. Yegorov, minister of the shipbuilding industry; I.S. Silayev, minister of the aviation industry; Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov, USSR first deputy minister of defense; USSR Deputy Ministers of Defense Marshal of Aviation A.I. Koldunov, Chief Marshal of Aviation P.S. Kutakhov, Admiral of the Fleet of the Soviet Union S.G. Gorshkov, and Army General I.N. Shkadov; Army General V.A. Matrosov, chief of the USSR KGB border troops; Admiral A.I. Sorokin, first deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; Lieutenant General B.P. Utkin, deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; Admiral P.N. Medvedev, member of the Military Council and chief of the Navy Political Directorate; Admiral V.N. Chernavin, chief of the Navy Main Staff; and generals, admirals, officers, navy veterans, and representatives of party, soviet, and public organizations.

The ceremony was opened by L.A. Borisov, secretary of the Moscow Party Gorkom. An honorary presidium comprising the CPSU Central Committee Politburo headed by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov was elected with great enthusiasm. A greetings message to seamen was delivered by P.P. Gorchakov, welder at a radio engineering equipment plant; D.A. Okhromiy, secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee; and M.V. Yegorov, minister of the shipbuilding industry. The ceremony was addressed by Admiral of the Fleet of the Soviet Union S.G. Gorshkov, commander in chief of the Navy and USSR deputy minister of defense.

We are celebrating Navy Day, he noted, in an atmosphere of political elation prompted by the nationwide struggle to implement the historic decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum and the preparations for the celebration of the 80th anniversary of the 2nd Russian Social Democratic Workers Party Congress. Navy seamen unanimously endorse the domestic and foreign policy of the party and government, are ready to fulfill all of the motherland's assignments, and are fully intent on strengthening the defense might of the land of the soviets.

The participants in the ceremony adopted with great enthusiasm a greetings letter to the CPSU Central Committee and to Comrade YU.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

A concert was given after the ceremony by the Baltic fleet double red banner song and dance company.